THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Lord Baldwin in a recent speech put the momentous question, 'How shall we overcome these Totalitarian systems, which enslave the mind, without being ourselves enslaved?' and he answered his own question by saying 'only if our spiritual effort exceeds and controls the material.' He recognized that the root of the present conflict is spiritual, and the victory must be spiritual too.

These words recurred to mind in reading one of the essays of Mr. Graham Wallas which have been published under the title of *Men and Ideas* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). Of Graham Wallas, Professor Gilbert Murray in a Preface to the book says beautifully, 'He remains to me a type of that *Humanitas* towards man and beast, which was once generally accepted without question as an ideal, then undermined by those four years during which the civilized peoples concentrated on doing the maximum of evil towards one another, and never fully restored during the following twenty years of reconstruction, hindered by irresolution and suspicion and stained with unparalleled cruelties.'

Once more it is war, and we may well put the anxious and dubious question whether when the war is over that noble quality of *Humanitas* shall be found in the earth. In an essay on 'Mental Training and the World Crisis' Graham Wallas has some suggestive things to say from the educational and Christian point of view.

His mind turns back to the crisis of fifteen hundred years ago when ancient civilization was visibly falling in ruins. 'All the structure of government on which the ancient world, as organized by Rome, had depended, had come to an end. Roman law was no longer valid; all the habits, all the loyalties, all the ideals, all the philosophies, all the religions of the ancient world were passing away, and men may have asked themselves at that time: "Is the mind of man sufficiently strong and wise to keep the reconstruction of the world under the control of rational purpose, or must we let disasters come, and their results slowly work out by a succession of accidents?"'

There was, indeed, intense and constructive thought going on in that critical age, for it was then that Augustine wrote his 'City of God,' but it was directed less to the reformation of this present evil world than to finding a way of escape from it. And so the world was left to welter through the dark ages with disastrous results for all time.

The problem before us to-day is of greater magnitude, and the danger we have to face is more intense than the danger at the fall of the ancient civilization. For one thing our social system is infinitely more complex. 'Where there were a few cultivators in the clearings of the woods, or a few wandering shepherds out in the plains, now there are millions and millions of industrialized and concentrated factory workers. The very existence

of the present population of the Eurasian continent depends upon organization, and to substitute accident and drift and confusion for organization means to reduce our population to something like what it was at the fall of the ancient world.' For another thing the situation is made more complex and difficult to handle because of the piling up year by year of immense masses of new knowledge about man and the conditions of man's life which we are finding it 'almost impossible, without the severest efforts, to bring into any co-ordinated system.' The situation, in short, threatens to get completely out of control and the problem to baffle human solution.

The supreme need of our time, therefore, is for new and creative thought, such thought as will give to man a new mastery over himself and his passions and all that mass of new knowledge which is now placed at his disposal but which he is so apt to turn to his own destruction. But the difficulty is that, while man can in general exercise control over his actions and feelings and thoughts, what we call new and creative thought is beyond his control and cannot be produced at will. As Shelley says in 'A Defence of Poetry': 'A man cannot say, "I will compose poetry." The greatest poet even cannot say it, for the mind in creation is as a fading coal which some invisible influence, like an inconstant wind, awakens to transitory brightness.' Neither the poet nor the prophet, neither the inspired statesman nor the discerner of the signs of the times can be made to order.

Must things, then, be left to chance? Must the blind forces at work in the world be suffered to take their way uncontrolled in the hope that through a chapter of happy accidents they will work out all right in the end? No, we are not forced to this conclusion. There are at least two things that can be done. While it is true that we cannot by direct effort produce new and creative thoughts any more than we can write new poetry, there are certain indirect efforts by means of which it can be made more likely that new and creative thoughts will come into the world for its guidance and help.

There must, of course, be energetic thought and planning. There must be a gathering together of the materials required for a solution of the problem, and conscious effort, concentrated and long sustained, to co-ordinate that material and search through it for the solution of the problem. But of more importance still, following upon that period of severe conscientious preparation, there must be a period of rest in which the subconscious mind, guided by its emotions, may produce new thoughts. 'Shelley, by allowing himself to brood with the full force of his poetic imagination, by toiling and striving to know and then waiting humbly till the conviction came upon him, saw more of the significance of what was happening in the world than nine hundred and ninety-nine out of a thousand of those who had taken a more direct part in events.' That is what he meant when he said, 'Poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the world.' The distinguished French mathematician, Henri Poincaré, tells how he worked hard at a mathematical problem to the utmost limit of logic without reaching a solution, but being called away to military service in a period of mental quiescence the solution came to him in a flash. 'This connexion between the preliminary period of hard thought and the suddenness of the discovery of inspiration has been noticed again and again by all sorts of writers.' Cases also might be quoted, like that of Darwin, where great thinkers have found a period of rest, perhaps through illness, more fruitful in creative thought than years of hard work. The importance, therefore, of such periods of quiet, humble, and receptive waiting cannot be exaggerated.

Now this fruitful quiescence which is so essential for the discovery of truth is what in the language of religion we call 'waiting upon God.' It does not exclude human thought and human energy but crowns them. Man may build his altar and lay the wood upon it, but he must wait for the fire from heaven. He cannot force a solution of his problem, at least not the right solution; he cannot drive through to a successful issue by sheer strength. There is an element in the situation which is beyond his control, which must be received as a gift from above through the secret inspiration of the Divine

Spirit. Is not this what the Psalmist means when he says, 'Vain is it to rise early for your work, and keep at work so late. . . . God's gifts come to His loved ones as they sleep?'

Is this understood? Is the value, yea the sheer necessity, of waiting upon God for guidance in the present crisis realized with any clearness and conviction? One fears that in many quarters it is not, but that the whole confidence of many is still placed in human strength and skill and armaments. A suggestion was recently made in the House of Commons that a day of national prayer should be appointed. In regard to this a member of the House asked cynically whether the Government would consult the leaders of the Army and Navy as to the strategic value of such a day. This sally was received with laughter, thoughtless laughter doubtless, but laughter which must have grated harshly on every Christian ear.

The overwhelming answer to such profane laughter would have been to say that the men in the last war, both in Navy and Army, who came through with most distinction and who brought the nation through, were men of prayer. Did not Admiral Beattie write home from the Grand Fleet that we should never win the victory we needed and hoped for till the people gave themselves more earnestly to prayer? Earl Haig never missed the hour of worship in the little Presbyterian chapel, and in the dark week of March, 1918, when in his famous dispatch he declared 'our backs are at the wall' he at the same time acknowledged that he sustained his heart by the last Sunday's text, 'The battle is not yours but God's.' It is emphasized in his biography that he had a profound belief in prayer, and to the end he cherished a fond vision that some day the nations might forgather on the blood-stained fields of Flanders in a great congress of intercession for the peace and welfare of the world. Foche also, the supreme commander, was of like mind. It is told of him that passing a wayside shrine he asked his staff to give him an hour of quiet. They thought he had gone in to sleep, but on the arrival of an urgent telegram they broke in upon him and found him before the altar on his knees in prayer.

A wealth of testimony to the same effect might be brought from the greatest workers and helpers of mankind, that in such hours of quiet waiting light and guidance came to them. And still men ask what is the use? Do we not here touch the very root of our problem? Is it not for lack of this spirit of humble waiting upon God that our world in its mad haste and violence has gone so far astray? When will men learn that 'except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it'? When will the harassed leaders and busy workers of our people be wise enough and humble enough to pause for a moment in their frantic activities and say with David, 'Wait on the Lord, and he shall strengthen thine heart: wait, I say, on the Lord?'

A book on preaching that is at once learned, entertaining, and instructive is a rare gift. Such a book is *The Art of Preaching: A Practical Survey of Preaching in the Church of England, 747–1939*, by the Rev. Charles Smyth, Fellow and Dean of Chapel, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net). It does not contain 'lectures on preaching,' like those of the Yale, Warrack, or any other foundation. Canon Smyth does not look hopefully on any of these lectureships as a source of instruction. He thinks you can only teach men to preach *indirectly* by 'tutorials and supervisions,' or by such a work as Professor Dodd's 'The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments.'

But he has a high sense of the value of preaching and the necessity of learning how to do it. On the very forefront of his book he places a remarkable utterance of Bishop Hensley Henson: 'Of all the actions of the Christian ministry preaching is the highest, and the test of our reverence for our profession is our performance of the preacher's duty.' That is a remarkable statement, coming from a minister of a church which is generally regarded as standing for the supreme value of worship and the secondary importance of the

sermon. But Canon SMYTH agrees with Bishop Henson, and emphatically asserts that the art has to be learned, quoting from Canon Twells: 'Beyond all question, the vast majority have to learn this thing. It is one of the dangers of the Church of England that so many don't learn it.'

Canon SMYTH holds that a great deal can be learned of the art by reading the history of preaching, and he has certainly made good his contention in the survey he has presented of preaching from the mediæval period, through Tillotson, to the nineteenth century and after. It has been a task of stupendous labour, of many years, of reading so wide and deep that many a man would have sunk in the sea out of our sight and left above the surface only flotsam and jetsam. But in this book we are accompanied by a human being, with a sense of humour, interested in life and people, and ready at all suitable places to turn aside and point the moral and adorn the tale.

What then are we to learn about preaching from this fascinating survey? First of all, and emphatically, that preaching is a *pastoral* function. You cannot preach the Word of God with power if you are isolated from the rough and tumble of a pastoral ministry. For it is precisely in the whole business of rubbing up against human opinions, human feelings, human anxieties and human needs that you encounter at every turn the real meaning and significance of your faith in God. 'Indeed, I know of no better stimulus for a preaching ministry than the decorous abandon of a Parish Social and the blessed drudgery of visiting old women with bad legs.'

Over and over again this is asserted and illustrated in these pages. And if Canon SMYTH had done nothing more than make this clear and convincing in his survey, he would have done a good deed. For it is one of the ominous facts of church life at present that clergy of all denominations appear to undervalue the necessity of pastoral visitation; indeed, in many cases, not to value it at all. This applies particularly to the younger members of the profession, who, too often, imagine that if you have a 'message' everything else is subsidiary.

The point Canon SMYTH insists on is that you will not have a message that can get over to the people unless you know them. 'No man can preach effectively who does not read his Bible and say his prayers and love his people.' But if he loves his people he will be much among them, learn all about their 'bad legs,' and about their children and their business and their difficulties. There may be exceptional men who are great preachers and yet live remote from ordinary life. But is not this 'great' preaching really a great *performance* which hearers enjoy as such?

The second lesson on preaching that emerges frequently in this review is that the *subject* of preaching is God's Word. The idea that the pulpit must be up-to-date has led preachers to discourse on topics that are supposed to be in their hearers' minds. It has 'stampeded the Anglican clergy' (the author writes in a delightful sentence) 'into preaching about Eddington and Jeans: the sort of thing that is now done only by the simpler type of Bishop when trying to impress an academic audience.' Or it may be the international situation that inspires the sermon, or 'the benevolent commonplaces of Ella Wheeler Wilcox expressed even more prosaically than in her poetry.'

The ministry of preaching is not only pastoral. It is prophetic. The real business of the preacher is to declare and minister the Word of God. Canon SMYTH objects to the statement of the late 'Dick' Sheppard: 'Science is not the primary interest of my life. My main interest is the Christian religion, by which I mean Jesus Christ, His views about God, and His Sermon on the Mount.' The idea of our Lord having 'views about God' is, says the writer, completely foreign to the language and to the theology of the New Testament.

You see, it is not the business of the Christian religion, neither is it the business of the Christian

preacher, to interest the public in 'views about God.' We are the stewards of Divine Revelation, the ministers of the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ. We were ordained to be messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord, to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children that are in the midst of this naughty world, that they might be saved through Christ for ever. We were not ordained to have views about God, or to wallow in the slough of a subjective pietism. That is the fundamental issue.

This same note of the prophetic function of preaching excludes the type that used to be known as 'moderate,' the preaching of morality. From this, which was so prevalent in the eighteenth-century pulpit, we were delivered by the evangelical revival, supplemented by the Oxford Movement. But 'moderatism' did not die without a struggle. 'Were you to inculcate the morality of Socrates,' said a famous Archbishop of York, 'you would do more good than canting about the New Birth.' The result was that, as Sydney Smith himself said, the sermons of that time were characterized by a 'decent debility.'

It was the Evangelicals who restored to us the preaching of the Cross. And it was they, at their best, who illustrated what may be called *direct* preaching. Canon SMYTH admits that generally in preaching the speaker should say 'we,' not 'you.' But there are times when, he says, it is necessary to break into the second person plural, and even into the second person singular. The great Evangelicals did it: 'My message is to *thee*, sinner! *Thou* who dost now appear in the presence of thy God—loathsome in thy sins—I challenge and command thee to bow thy stubborn neck, and to bend thy knee.' That is speech only possible for men who know they have the authority of the Word of God and that they are commissioned to declare it.

These are the two impressions left on our minds by this interesting volume. Preaching, to be effective, must be pastoral and it must be prophetic. If it were both, what a power it might be! Naturally, in such a survey as he has given us, Canon SMYTH records his judgment of many well-known practitioners of the 'art of preaching.' And it may be interesting to set down his opinion of two in particular. He has an intense admiration for Robertson of Brighton. And he has no admiration at all for Cardinal Newman. 'For the ecclesiastical historian,' he says, 'it is extraordinarily difficult to regard Newman in any other light than as an evangelical gone to the bad.' And: 'Judging from the volumes of his printed sermons, it is difficult, at least for one of my generation, to see why they should have been so extravagantly praised.' This may well be the final verdict on Newman as a preacher.

Professor Robert CORKEY holds the Chair of Christian Ethics in the Presbyterian College, Belfast. He is also a representative of Queen's University, Belfast, in the Parliament of Northern Ireland. Accordingly, we turn to his recent study in ultimate war aims, *War, Pacifism, and Peace* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net), in the hope of finding in it a treatment of this topic at once scholarly and practical. Nor are we disappointed.

Let us begin by quoting from Viscount Cecil's Foreword: 'There is one proposition upon which all peace-lovers may agree, whether or not they accept the views of those called "pacifists." We all desire the abolition of war, and we all believe that international peace cannot be safely or satisfactorily maintained except upon a moral basis. It is therefore of the utmost importance that all who are concerned with the future of international relations—and who is not?—should examine closely the question of how far war is consistent with international morality. Hence this book, so temperately and convincingly written, should be very useful in enabling unprejudiced persons to reach a conclusion on a point on which the whole future of civilization may depend.'

The heart of the book is its discussion of the problem of war from the standpoint of the fundamental Christian moral principle of neighbourly or brotherly love. Dr. CORKEY is far from satisfied with the arguments of out-and-out pacifists, regarding them as often inconsistent with this fundamental principle. Without taking sides in the issue we shall state certain of those arguments and show the way in which it is here sought to meet them.

The pacifist (that is, the extreme or out-and-out pacifist) sometimes urges that war is inconsistent with the Commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill.' But Dr. CORKEY holds that it is a defective theory of the good which regards it as a quality in good acts regardless of results or consequences; in other words, which looks upon certain types of acts as in themselves always right irrespective of what the results or consequences may be. It is possible to imagine situations in which to take life would be, most emphatically, to do the right thing. It must not be allowed that the Sixth Commandment prohibits all war.

Again, the pacifist sometimes urges that it is never right to do evil that good may come. There is an element of truth in this opinion, Dr. CORKEY allows, but that element of truth must be clearly understood before we can safely apply the principle to a problem such as that of war. It becomes a misleading principle if it is taken to mean that, since war in itself is an evil, it can never be used in pursuit of an end that is good. In our efforts for peace we may not always be able to avoid war.

Yet again, the pacifist sometimes urges that a sincere Christian is never obliged to choose the lesser of two evils; there is always a way out by the way of the Cross or its equivalent. But Dr. CORKEY holds that this comfortable notion of an ideal third way is contrary to everyday experience. In a truly tragic dilemma the obligation to make a choice is indeed a cross, but the mere refusal to choose is not really the acceptance of a cross in the Christian sense but a dereliction of duty.

Finally, the pacifist sometimes urges that we must consider the example of sacrifice set before the world in the Cross of Christ; will not the way to the world's peace be found in the voluntary sacrifice of some martyr nation? Says Dr. CORKEY, there is a sense in which nations must sacrifice themselves if peace is to come to the world, but it is a gratuitous hypothesis that the times of war would be at an end if a nation could be found sufficiently devoted to the ideals of peace to discard all its armaments, accept indignity and impoverishment in quietness, and allow the aggressor to dictate its policy and determine its destiny. Mankind will not believe that in all disputes which may lead to war justice ought to be allowed to go by default; still less that abiding peace can be established in that way.

Constructive Theology.

VII. Sin.

By the Reverend J. S. Whale, M.A., D.D., President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge.

I. The Metaphysical Problem and the Moral Fact.

In the light of its presuppositions, a Christian doctrine of sin seems bound to do violence to logic. Must it not attempt to combine two mutually exclusive ideas — (*a*) the sole causality and sovereignty of the Creator, and (*b*) the moral evil of the rebellious human will?

Far from being an academic conundrum of no practical importance this dilemma has never ceased to challenge Christian thought. Sometimes it has actually transformed Christian thought, either into Pantheism in the interests of philosophy, or into Deism in the interests of ethics. Hence the sting in Inge's epigram: 'The notion of a finite God is one that the moralist can never afford to forget nor the metaphysician to remember.'

But whatever difficulties it may raise for thought, any doctrine of sin which is to be truly Christian must insist on the reality of moral evil. For us, a survey of three fields leaves it indubitable.

(i) The first is the field of philosophical monism as represented by a Spinoza or a Hegel. Great philosophical systems tend to be unsatisfactory in their treatment of sin because they are *systems* whose logical unity leaves no room for the paradoxes and antinomies of Biblical religion. Immanentist in spirit they virtually deny the reality of moral evil, the violence which they do to moral experience being the price paid for a watertight metaphysic.

For Spinoza, evil is an illusion to which we give a fictitious substantiality because we cannot see the Whole *sub specie aeternitatis*. Our outlook is necessarily limited because we live *sub specie temporis*. All that is, including the finite subject, is but a passing mode of the divine Whole. The independent reality of the finite subject being thus dissolved, to speak of its sin or its sainthood is meaningless. Such modalism is ultimately amoral.

Hegelian absolutism makes the same attack on the concrete individualities of our temporal experience. The main count against it from the standpoint of the Hebraic-Christian revelation is twofold. First, the God of this pantheistic monism is not the living God, known for what He is by what He does in history, but an impersonal Absolute, 'an Identity in which differences vanish . . . a Unity conceived merely as the aggregation of differences it includes.' Second, Hegelianism belittles the importance of time and of history, which is 'no more than an illusory vesture of unchanging metaphysical relations. Nothing real ever moves.'[1] If this were so it would be the end of the gospel of Him who in the fullness of time, *sub Pontio Pilato*, took flesh and dwelt among us. Further, it would be the end of all moral experience. In a timeless world moral victory and moral defeat would be alike meaningless. For time is the form of our practical activity; our temporal form of experience is peculiarly the form of the will, as such. To dissolve time away, therefore, at the behest of speculative rationalism, would not only destroy the religion of the Incarnation; it would solve the problem of sin by denying that there is one.

The same warning comes, with even more force, from two giants in systematic theology for whom this conflict between metaphysical system and deep evangelical experience is inward and not fully resolved. As philosophers, both Augustine and Schleiermacher deny the metaphysical reality of moral evil. Augustine the philosopher regards it as privation or negation; the evil will has no efficient cause but only a *causa deficiens*, to seek for which would be like seeking to see darkness. But Augustine the religious man certainly knew that evil could be the most overwhelmingly positive thing in our experience; the sustained polemic of

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, 136–7.

a lifetime is his witness to it. Again, Schleiermacher writes as a philosopher of the school of Spinoza when he asserts that sin is only sin from our subjective point of view. Yet it is this same Schleiermacher who in the name and power of Lutheran Pietism vindicates religion against its cultured despisers.

(ii) The second field is that of the religious Monism of the East, as represented by Buddhism or Taoism. Here the flight from the concrete and the historical leads, not to rationalism but to mysticism. Whereas, for Hebraism, history is an instrument of the Eternal, for Oriental Monism it is merely a symbol. The One remains; the many change and pass. The world of beings and things is only a wave on the sea of the Infinite, covered with ephemeral ripples which, like the wave itself, will yield to others. The Infinite alone is real. Just as the river swept by the wind gives birth to endless waves which melt into one another and set the lotus swaying; so the current of life—vegetable, animal, and human—is the perpetual flux which merely translates Universal Being through the changing materiality of its forms.[1] Thus, suffering rather than sin is the great evil of man's life; it feeds on desire. Salvation, which comes only with the elimination of all desire, means complete identification with the Soul of the Universe, *i.e.* the elimination of 'personality' itself. Plainly enough, there is no place here for the correlative facts of sin and guilt which testify to a broken personal relationship between creator and creature. In fact, this is a different world from the one we know.

(iii) The third field is the world of our own experience, which speaks decisively of the grim reality of sin as rebellion against God. Believing men who have looked into the face of Christ cannot hesitate here; to do so would be sophistry. The moral consciousness, confronted with and informed by Christ, knows that 'sin *is* sin, with all its damning guilt upon it.' Indeed, the reality, nature and meaning of sin is not fully known by us until Christ reveals the mind of God towards it in His Action and Passion. Sin is known for what it is by what it does, and by what God does with it. It slays the Prince of Life, who makes it the occasion of redeeming grace. God's pardon in Christ crucified demonstrates the reality and the nature of sin as nothing else does. 'The Cross is a revelation of the true character of God, man and history, within every moment of history. As a revelation of the true character of man the Cross reveals not only what man is *truly* (for Christ as the second Adam is the norm of man's true nature), but also what man is *actually*; for in actuality man is always the crucifier of Christ, despite his conscious efforts to approximate to the perfection of Christ.'[2]

The problem of the reality of sin thus gives place to the problem of its nature. How is it to be understood and explained?

II. Evolution and Sin: the Insufficiency of the 'Atavistic' Explanation.

According to a widespread modern view, brilliantly expounded by Tennant, sin is explicable as an 'evolutionary overhang' from man's animal origin. The primary incentives to sin are natural, inborn, morally neutral instincts and passions which belong to man as God has chosen to make him by evolutionary process from the lower creation. These non-moral incentives to action are the common inheritance of the human stock from its mammalian origins. In the biological sense they are essential to the very existence, continuance and well-being of the human race. Morally innocent and indifferent in themselves, they are the basis and the very condition of our highest virtues as well as of our lowest vices. Indeed, they may be called the raw material of man's moral activity and as such they are as much the *fomes boni* as the *fomes peccati*.

Moreover, as Tennant has effectively insisted, it is disastrous to confound these inborn conative tendencies with the activity of the human will in regard to them; for sin is always a matter of man's conscious and responsible volition. Propensities which are non-volitional cannot properly be called sinful (*pace* Augustine and the Reformers). It is man's will which shapes, not the stuff which is shaped, which alone calls for moral approval or

[1] Cf. *L'Art de l'extrême Orient*—Paysages, Fleurs, Animaux—15 planches. Texte de René Grousset [Librairie Plon, Paris]. Such a representative collection of classic Chinese art admirably expounds the essential meaning of 'Monism.'

[2] Reinhold Niebuhr, *Europe's Catastrophe and the Christian Faith*, 30.

disapproval. Thus, it is not the existence in man of appetitive senses which makes him a sinner but his voluntary surrender to them, either by intention or in act, when he emerges as a rational being. The stage of sinfulness is reached when these conative tendencies become moralized. Propensities not in themselves sinful are the condition of sin's emergence when responsible, willing man is evolved from the irresponsible, impulsively striving animal. Many people insist that this analysis is a sufficient explanation of the emergence of sinfulness in every child of man who attains to moral discretion. The empirical universality of sin is 'explained' in terms of the chronological priority of impulse to conscience. Sin is an anachronistic survival. Essentially it is an atavism.

Apart from the sturdy moralism of this position which is almost held—to borrow Anselm's phrase —*remoto Christo*, at least three criticisms present themselves at once.

(i) First, we meet the old and tragic question: Why is sin universal? Even if we admit that this theory describes *how* sin happens, why does it happen always and everywhere? How are we to account for that bias or perversion of the human will which makes sin an empirically universal fact and therefore virtually inevitable? As the very condition of moral action man must be free to choose the evil; but why is it that all men without exception do so, unless a sinful tendency is somehow part of their very nature? All serious thought about the mystery of iniquity has had to grapple with this its constitutional as well as its volitional aspect. We may abandon the classical doctrine of Original Sin where it is bound up with the morally insupportable doctrine of Original Guilt, but we are still left with the historical fact of universal moral imperfection (in all its gradations) whose reality that grim doctrine attested. As Edwyn Bevan has observed[1] about the doctrine of Original Sin, so difficult of acceptance; when people say that man is naturally good or that his good and bad impulses are pretty evenly matched, how is it that all over the world to follow the good impulses has seemed like going uphill, and to follow the evil ones like going downhill?

[1] *Symbolism and Belief*, 63.

(ii) Again, since sin necessarily implies guilt, how are we to explain it, *i.e.* determine its causes, without *eo ipso* explaining its guilt away? Surely sin, like freedom, is *ex hypothesi* inexplicable. For moral action presupposes freedom in the sense of real alternatives of choice. Personal responsibility is the essence of what we mean by moral personality. But if man is free, no scientific formula can possibly cover the universality of sin without taking away the element of responsibility which makes it what it is. Any alleged explanation of the fact that all men sin is only a new determinism. If sin, universal as it is, is to be treated as a moral fact and not as a natural fact, such as the secretion of the bile, it must remain inexplicable. Determine the causes of a universal moral fact and it ceases to be moral; it becomes natural and is no more patient of moral evaluation than are gravitation or the beating of the heart or death. It is interesting to note that in his *Origin and Propagation of Sin* (p. 113) Tennant was unwary enough to write of sin as 'something empirically inevitable for every man.' He withdrew the offending phrase when he wrote his brilliant *Concept of Sin* (see p. 260); yet it may be doubted whether the phrase does not still express the implicit logic of his position. 'The attempt,' says Althaus,[2] 'to trace sin back to an empirical fact which causes it, invalidates man's god-given sense that he is a will and a person. The will—and sin is an act of will—is *ex hypothesi* that which is nonderivable (das was nicht abgeleitet werden kann).' Man's sinful will cannot be 'explained'; it must remain as the one completely irrational fact in a world which God created and saw to be 'very good.'

(iii) The third difficulty here, on which von Hügel lays his sensitive finger,[3] is that this 'ultimately single-source theory,' though it simplifies many pressing problems, fails to distinguish between two distinct and different sources of man's difficulties as a spiritual being. Being extended to all sins, this evolutionary hypothesis is made to cover that Pride and Self-Love which, in the Christian view, is the *specifica differentia* of sin. Pride and Self-sufficiency are made to depend as truly upon

[2] *Grundriss d. Dogmatik*, ii. 66.
[3] *Essays and Addresses*, i. 8–9.

our animal descent as do gluttony or sloth. But, as von Hügel rightly argues, 'This single derivation will simply not work.' Christianity knows that the central, typical and fatal sin is ego-centric pride. 'Impurity may be the viler sin, but even Impurity is instinctively felt here to be less deadly than Pride. . . . Whilst Impurity is occasioned by the body, Pride is not; the doctrine of the Fall of the Angels grandly illustrates this deep instinct.' He goes on to point out the double characteristic of all intelligent creatures—that they are dependent upon God for their very existence and their essentially finite powers; and yet God has endowed them with a certain limited power of independence to say Yes or No.

Man's capacity not only for obedience but also for proud defiance constitutes the mystery of the Fall. *Imago Dei* and *Peccatum* are correlative facts peculiar to man. The fundamental instinct of the animal world is the will to survive. Man's sin cannot be so explained, since it cannot be so described. It is the will to power which differentiates man from the animal and constitutes the tragic dissidences of human history. Selfishness measures the tragedy of the world because sin is man's unwillingness to accept the absolute authority and claim of God in whose image he has been made.

III. *Imago Dei* and *Superbia.*

The Bible speaks of man in terms of three related facts. (i) Like the animals he is a creature. Though he is God's last and highest earthly creature, his creatureliness is an inescapable and abiding fact. (ii) Unlike the animals, he is more than a natural creature. He is lifted above all other earthly creatures in being made in the image of God, and in being aware of the fact. This responsible awareness (*Ansprechbarkeit,* as Brunner has called it) is man's greatness and his fatal temptation. (iii) Unlike the animals, he is a sinner; he falls below all earthly creatures in his rebellious denial of a responsibility which they can never know.

Thus, the Biblical doctrine of the *Imago* is the key to the Biblical understanding of the nature and content of sin. God, who is Love, is Creator. He calls men into existence that their willing response to His love may fulfil His creative purpose. As Brunner points out, man's 'responsibility' is not a task but a gift, not law but grace.[1] The Word through which and *in* which man has his existence, is not an imperative but an indicative of the divine love. Man's 'Yes' is to be a response not to 'Thou shalt,' but to 'I have created and called thee; thou art Mine.' The essence of sin, therefore, is man's self-centred denial of his distinctive endowment. Its final ground is Pride (*superbia*) which, as unbelief, repudiates the purpose of creation. Its active manifestation is Self-Love (*concupiscentia*) which 'changes the glory of the incorruptible God into the image of the corruptible man.' The result is alienation from God (Eph $4^{17f.}$, Ro 1^{18}). Man's freedom *for* God and *in* God is distorted and perverted to mean freedom *from* God. *Imago Dei* is interpreted to mean *Eritis sicut Deus.*

But man, though a sinner, remains God's creature. His very sin testifies to the image which it defaces. No animal is able thus to rebel against its endowment, but no man is able to destroy his endowment. Sin always presupposes the *Imago Dei* (a fact which has an important bearing on the meaning of Total Corruption. See IV. below). Man, to quote Brunner again, 'could not be godless without God.'[2] Therefore, the consequences of this alienation from God are real and terrible. The form in which rebellious and fallen man experiences the love of God is Wrath. His responsibility to God ceases to be the formula of his created being and becomes a formula of his obligation. Liberty becomes bondage. This is the 'curse of the Law,' that the will of God which it announces as the law of man's being is no longer a gift of life and the most natural thing in the world, but a death-bringing demand.[3]

Moreover, the Parables of the Pharisee and the Publican, or of the Mote and the Beam, confirm the profound insight of a Paul, an Augustine, or a Luther, that any claim to be fulfilling the Law's demands, and to be obeying one's way into a right relation with God, is not only to be blind to the meaning of grace; it is to misunderstand the will of God altogether. This legalistic relation to God is itself sin at its most subtle and dangerous. 'The

[1] *Man in Revolt,* 98. [2] *Op. cit.* 187.
[3] *Op. cit.* 156.

autarchy of the religiously moral man' is precisely the full measure of sin, because it is the final sin of self-righteousness.

It should be noted that the difference between the moralism of Pharisee or Stoic and the penitence of Christian faith, lies here. The former is still ego-centric; it is not the same thing as the latter which sees, accepts, and responds to the supernatural gift of love and pardon in Christ crucified. Christian faith means leaving the fatal circle of ego-centricity and forgetting ourselves, our aspirations and achievements altogether, as we direct our gaze to Christ on the Cross.

Sin refers primarily, therefore, not to individual or isolated acts of will, but to the fundamental inward disposition which they illustrate. Sin is a state or condition. Man is not a sinner because he commits sins; he commits sins because he is a sinner. In short, classical Christian anthropology has always fixed its attention on the larger context in which a sinful individual stands at any moment. Repudiating the grotesque atomism of the Pelagian psychology of volition, it has asserted two truths of experience.

(i) My sin is always the act of the moment just now passed, yet it is not something accidental, solitary, or purely capricious. In large measure it is the necessary result and expression of the way in which my will has been set up till now. In this sense my will is *servum arbitrium*; though my will determines my being, my being determines my will. I cannot treat my empirical being as my 'fate,' as though it were something for which I am not answerable. I am both the product of my past and its responsible creator.

(ii) In the second place, no man liveth unto himself. My sin, though always my own personal act, is never a merely individual act; at its deepest it is grounded in that which I have in common with all mankind. What a modern theologian describes as 'eine unentrinnbare und überindividuelle Bestimmtheit des Menschseins' is, in part, what the New Testament means by those super-personal entities—'the flesh' and 'the world.' Each individual is in 'the world' as both subject and object. Inasmuch as he is object, his sin represents what Ritschl called the 'Kingdom of Sin'—the totality of individual sinful acts of will in their mutual interaction; 'the world' is built up out of all this, according to the observable laws of psychology and sociology. But inasmuch as he is subject, a man's sin is always his own free act. The supra-individual Will expresses itself in him, but in such a way that it is *he* who wills. The antinomy is irresolvable, but it is there. Past and Present, Givenness and Decision, Common Will and Individual Will, Necessity and Freedom, are bound together in a paradoxical unity which is authenticated by the deepest, darkest things in our experience.

Man, whether considered as an individual or collectively, is ever confronted with this dark yet unambiguous paradox; that sin is rooted in his inmost disposition, yet he cannot but feel himself responsible for it; it is constitutive of his empirical being, yet it is indubitably that for which his will is responsible. Was it an extravagance on the part of our Protestant fathers when they summed up this situation as one of 'total corruption'?

IV. Total Corruption.

If this classic conception means *simpliciter* that 'we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil' (West. Conf., vi. 4), it is indefensible. If total corruption means that every man is as bad as he can be, it is totally absurd, simply because the conception is 'self-destroying,' as Professor John Baillie has recently reminded us. A completely non-moral man would not be a man at all. 'A totally corrupt being would be as incapable of sin as would a totally illogical being of fallacious argument.'[1] In spite of the deplorable extravagance of their language here, the Reformers were insisting on the profound truth that the depravity which sin has produced in human nature extends to the whole of it. There is no part of man's nature—not even his virtue—which is unaffected by it. Total corruption does not and never did mean (*pace* Luther's occasional outbursts[2]) that the

[1] *Our Knowledge of God*, 33. See also James Denney's admirable *Studies in Theology*, 82 f.

[2] It should be noted that Calvin, unlike Luther, refused to admit the total corruption of human reason. Indeed, as Gloede proves conclusively in his *Theologia naturalis bei Calvin*, the Genevan reformer makes

stream of human history, instead of being crystal clear, is solid mud; but that it is dirty in every part of its course; that even the purest ideals and the most disinterested achievements of individuals and societies are tainted by self-interest. Human justice is itself proof of this, since anything short of love as revealed in Christ cannot be perfect justice. Love, as Niebuhr reminds us, 'is the only final structure of freedom'; and our justice is a monument to the radical and abiding wrongness of humanity as measured by the absolute ethic of love.

The Reformers always look at human virtue, not from the ethical but from the theocentric standpoint. There, all righteousness is as filthy rags. They had no wish to deny that, ethically considered, man is a mixture of good and evil and that men's sins differ in degree and direction. They were not blind to the evidence of the New Testament as to extenuating circumstances, moral growth, or what is relatively good (*e.g.* Mk 12^{34}, Mt $8^{5f.}$, Lk $10^{25f.}$, Jn $1^{45f.}$ $3^{19f.}$, Lk 23^{34}, Ac 3^{17} $17^{29f.}$). The Reformers, and the Puritans after them, were always alive to the peril and horror of antinomianism. Indeed, by their recognition of *justitia philosophica* they fully admitted man's positive achievements for good in the arts and sciences, and in politics. By their insistence, however, that man is 'utterly leprous and unclean' they meant that rebellious and fallen man is utterly impotent to come to that saving knowledge of God for which he was created. An ethical calculus of virtues and vices is irrelevant when there is a fundamental and irreparable wrongness alienating every child of man from God. The Reformers knew that it is fatally easy for a man to use his moral rectitude to veil the proud egocentricity which it supremely illustrates. Man's nature is corrupted by sin. This is a fact which events are again forcing upon the notice of our sturdy Pelagians. The doctrine of total corruption represents and will represent the great truth that though man can do many wonderful things there is *one* thing which he cannot do. He cannot bring his state into harmony with his nature. He cannot fulfil the destiny for which he was created. 'When a man has been discovered,' wrote Denney, 'who has been able, *without Christ*, to reconcile himself to God and to obtain dominion over the world and over sin, *then* the doctrine of inability, or of the bondage due to sin may be denied; *then*, but *not till then*' (*op. cit.*, 85).

In these days, perhaps, the most useful comment on this great doctrine may come not from theologians, nor even from the great hymn writers, but from an artist whose appeal to experience is all the more striking in that she makes it in her own way. Katherine Mansfield is here in line with *Romans* and *Rock of Ages*:

'It is so very difficult to be humble. . . . I know exactly where I fail . . . when I have finished a story I catch myself preening my feathers . . . it's so disheartening. There seems to be some bad old pride in my heart; a root of it that puts out a thick shoot on the slightest provocation. This interferes very much with work. One can't be calm, clear, good as one must be while it goes on. I look at the mountains, I try to pray, and I think of something CLEVER! It's a kind of excitement within that shouldn't be there. Calm yourself. Clear yourself. Anything I write in this mood will be no good: it will be full of sediment. . . . One must learn, one must practise to forget oneself. . . .

May I be found worthy to do it! Lord make me crystal clear for Thy light to shine through!'

V. The Fall.

Serious thought about sin always involves an inevitable and irresolvable antinomy. As a universal fact of human experience sin is virtually unavoidable. As a moral fact it is a matter of personal decision and responsibility. How are we to express the idea of *un*-freedom without laying ourselves open to the charge of determinism?

The Church has attempted to do so in terms of man's Original State and the Fall, but it has defeated its own intention by treating as literal history what can only be a mythological framework. It has proved fatal to try to construct a history of sin out of the concept of its inevitability. Luther's extravagant description of the perfections of man's primitive state are as notoriously fantastic as South's sermon on 'Man created in God's Image,' which contained the famous sentence: 'An

far more of 'natural theology' than it is fashionable in these days to allow him to do. Gloede's book corrects the one-sided impression left by Peter Barth in his *Das Problem d. natürlichen Theologie bei Calvin* [T.E.H. 18].

Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam, and Athens but the rudiments of Paradise.'

The difficulty is twofold. First, the victory of the scientific view (palæontology, biology, and anthropology) shatters this picture as history. Second, the Adam story is the main source of that determinism with which even Karl Barth reproaches the classic anthropology of Christendom. Augustinianism, at least, in spite of its profound psychological insight, founders on this twofold rock.

The idea of a Fall from an Original State of perfection is really a limiting conception, a theological *Grenzbegriff*. It is a 'mythological' rather than a scientific statement. To quote Auguste Lecerf in another, similar context: 'cette image, irréalisable pour l'imagination, est en quelque sorte nécessaire pour l'intelligence' (*Dogmatique reformée*, i. 291). It involves no scientific description of historical beginnings. Eden is on no map, and Adam's Fall fits into no historical calendar. Moses is not nearer to the Fall than we are, because he lived over three thousand years before our time. The Fall refers not to some dateable aboriginal calamity in the historic past of humanity but to a dimension of human experience which is always present—namely, that we who have been created for fellowship with God repudiate it continually, and that the whole of mankind does this along with us. Every man is his own 'Adam,' and all men are solidarily 'Adam.'

Thus, Paradise before the Fall—the *status perfectionis*—is not a period of history but our 'memory' of a divinely intended quality of life, given to us along with our consciousness of guilt. It is 'nicht historischer sondern wesentlicher Art' (Althaus).

Again, man's tragic apostasy from God is not something which happened once for all a long time ago. It is true in every moment of existence. The symbolism of the Fall is the necessary complement of the symbolism of the Creation story. It affirms the notorious conflict between man's recalcitrant will and that divine purpose in which alone man and his world find their true meaning. It describes that age-long misdirection of human life which is the very presupposition of the gospel. 'A second Adam to the fight, and to the rescue, came.'

Literature.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Students of the New Testament will look forward to using the Commentary on the Fourth Gospel which has been prepared by the late Rev. Sir Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, Bart., D.D., and edited by his collaborator in 'The Riddle of the New Testament,' the Rev. Francis Noel Davey—*The Fourth Gospel* (Faber & Faber; 2 vols., 30s. net). It will, however, be a deep regret to them that the Commentary was not completely prepared for the Press before Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' death. As Mr. Davey says, 'Like his greatest English predecessor, Westcott, Hoskyns died without having been able to give to the chief undertaking of his life final shape.'

Of the Introduction the first three chapters, about half the fourth chapter, and the fifth and sixth chapters, were completed and passed for the Press by the author himself. The final chapter—'The Theological Tension of the Fourth Gospel'—has been compiled by the editor mainly from two rough drafts. But it is well that it should be included, for it presents the major conclusions about the exegesis of the Fourth Gospel to which his long study had led Hoskyns. The Introductory Essay supplied by the editor is based on material found in one of the most recent of Hoskyns' notebooks, concerning the Historicity of the Fourth Gospel.

Says the editor: 'The Introduction palpably lacks a great deal which a reader rightly expects and which Hoskyns intended to provide. The actual evidence of the authorship would have been given and sifted: quotations from the Fourth Gospel in the Christian literature of the second century would have been listed and discussed: there would have been a full bibliography of Patristic commentaries and an examination of the relation between Philo and

the Fourth Gospel: possibly there would have been a chapter upon the relation of Johannine to Pauline theology.' But he goes on to point out that these omissions do not constitute so grave a lacuna as at first sight might seem probable. The chapters that appear in the Introduction deal with the essential aspects of the fundamental questions that lie behind the problems of authorship and date, and it is Hoskyns' peculiar contribution to the Johannine problem to relate these questions to the fundamental theological issue of the Fourth Gospel.

This indeed is the special claim that is made for the work before us, that while it does not neglect questions of authorship, date, provenance, and literary origins, its primary concern is with theological exposition; on the principle, acknowledged in recent years by scientific criticism, that theologically conceived documents should be treated as theology.

As for the Commentary, only the first six chapters of the Gospel were completed and passed for the Press by Hoskyns; the Commentary on the remaining chapters (contained in the second volume of the work) has been left in the form in which Hoskyns had drafted it before 1931. But as this material represents Hoskyns' considered exegesis of the Fourth Gospel in the most creative period of his life, probably the chief cause for regret in this part of the Commentary is the absence of the introductions and summaries with which the first six chapters are interspersed, and of many projected Detached Notes.

The solid quality and masterly style of the work are revealed at once in the Introduction, where are reviewed at the outset the critical orthodoxy, the traditional orthodoxy, and the critical *via media*, in which last the attempt is made to secure a balance between mysticism or symbolism and rigid historicity. And in this connexion justice is done to the contribution of Renan. Hoskyns' own standpoint appears in the statement that 'the Fourth Gospel is less an Apostolic witness to history than an Apostolic witness to that which is beyond history, but which is, nevertheless, the meaning of the "Jesus of History," and therefore the meaning of all history.' He makes much of the distinction between the 'Apostolic witness' as what the crowd of eye-witnesses saw and heard of the Jesus of History, and the 'Apostolic witness' as what the disciples saw of the glory of the Word of God; what they apprehended, as believers, when Jesus *was risen from the dead.*

'Thus the ultimate authority underlying the Johannine Writings is strictly theological. The author refuses to permit his readers any rest until they have passed behind himself, behind the Church, to the Apostles, and behind them again to the flesh of Jesus, the Son of Man, and behind the visible, historical Jesus to the glory of the Son, of the Word, of God; until, that is to say, they come to rest in God, *whom no man hath seen at any time*, but who manifested Himself in His Son, and through His Son to the world.'

This is the point of view which we are asked to take with us as we use the Commentary, which is abundantly rich in critical and exegetical material. For his editing of the Commentary, as for his Introductory Essay, and indeed for all the labour he has expended so ably and conscientiously upon this important work, we must record our gratitude to the Rev. Francis Noel Davey.

FEDERATION AND WORLD ORDER.

In a recent issue of the 'Christian Century' of New York, a periodical which represents solid and responsible American opinion, the conviction was expressed that if a *true* Federal system can be established in Europe, the United States will be unable to remain outside, but will feel compelled to take a share in making the new Union world-wide, to the end that war may be completely and finally outlawed. But the proviso is added that the new Union must be genuine, that is, it must not be composed merely of a section of European States arrayed against another section, for example the Democratic States against the Totalitarian States. Any such sectional Federalism, instead of banishing war, would merely make war more certain and more deadly.

Such an opinion, expressed by a leading organ of American thought, should make us think earnestly. It should also drive us to a thorough study of the problems of Federalism, and of the methods of establishing Federalism. To this end the recently published book on *Federation and World Order*, by Duncan and Elizabeth Wilson (Nelson; 2s. 9d. net), appears at exactly the right time. It contains an analysis of various existing Federal constitutions, together with a sufficient account of the manner in which they were set up. It also has an account of the preparatory work already accomplished by the League of Nations, as leading up to eventual Federalism.

The book is full of interesting 'pegs' on which the convinced federalist can hang further thought concerning the founding of the United States of the World. He should follow our example and have a

pencil by his side as he reads it, in order to mark these points as likely to prove useful for future discussion with his friends. For instance, in the coming World Federation are we going to follow the example of the United States in reserving for the constituent States all powers not expressly vested in the Federal Government by the Constitution? Are we going to allow the States to keep the right of determining the qualifications of those who are to vote in Federal elections? How large a quorum should be required in the Federal Senate, which will represent the States; and should it be larger than, or not so large as, the quorum in the Lower Federal House, which will represent the populations? Are we going to follow the example of Canada in allowing the 'recall' of State delegates to the Federal Legislature? Are we going to eschew all ideas of forcing States into the Union (it is most earnestly to be hoped that we *are* going to eschew all such ideas), as was done by the United States in the case of Rhode Island and North Carolina, and by Canada in the case of Prince Edward Island?

The book starts any number of interesting 'hares' of this kind; and it calls for much more than careful reading as a text-book of Federalism from the constitutional and political points of view. It is an educative book in the fullest sense; for almost every page of it stimulates the reader to follow up further on his own account the terms of thought to which it gives rise. There is urgent need for the widespread reading, marking, learning, and inwardly digesting of such books, if we are to have—and have in time—the absolutely essential federally-educated populace, without which World Union can never become a fact.

A COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS.

Of good books on the Psalms we can never have too many, and the general complaint is that in recent years we have not had nearly enough. Three years ago the Rev. Prebendary W. O. E. Oesterley gave us an adequate Introduction in 'A Fresh Approach to the Psalms.' He has now followed this up with a full-length Commentary in two volumes—*The Psalms—Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes* (S.P.C.K.; 16s. each volume). The two volumes, which together comprise six hundred medium octavo pages, may presumably be bought separately. Volume I. contains fourteen chapters of Introduction compressed into just over a hundred pages, together with commentary on Psalms 1–65; the remainder of the Psalms are dealt with in volume II. Professor T. H. Robinson, whose collaboration with Prebendary Oesterley has been so happy and fruitful, contributes four chapters of the Introduction, together with the commentary on Psalms 55–60, 68, 73–84, 86, 88, and 90. The work is intended primarily for non-Hebraists. This meets the more urgent need; but it goes without saying that since Dr. Oesterley has based his researches on the Hebrew text, besides exacting contributions from the international literature on the subject, the student of Hebrew will find it equally valuable. He has, besides, Dr. Oesterley's editions of the Hebrew text of Psalms, Books III. and IV. in the S.P.C.K. Texts series.

A notable feature of recent commentary work is its return to simplicity, coupled with regard for the religious significance of the Bible for to-day, and the present work is in line with this general tendency. It is not cluttered up with textual emendations, nor with metrical and strophic theories. Some emendation, of course, there must be, but it is reduced to a minimum. The general text-critical standpoint is both interesting and significant. While it is now generally agreed that there is a considerable amount of pre-exilic material in the Psalter, it is equally agreed that such materials have been freely adapted to the needs of post-exilic times. Is the textual critic to enter the domain of higher criticism, and attempt to restore the earliest form of the original, or is he to present the text in its final, and frequently adapted, form? Dr. Oesterley has chosen the latter course, and the majority of his readers will feel that he is right. The text to be interpreted is, in the first instance, the text as it was admitted into the Canon, not the text as it existed in some first draft.

The method of treatment in the main body of the Commentary is to begin with one or more paragraphs descriptive of the nature and contents of the particular Psalm. This is followed by a translation—as literal as is consistent with reasonably good English—and this again by the textual notes. The Commentary itself is a kind of extended paraphrase. This—as compared with the older method of writing notes on single words or verses—leaves the reader with an impression of the Psalm as an organic whole. Finally, there are one or more paragraphs on the Religious Teaching. These, it need hardly be said, are intended to be suggestive, not to provide ready-made sermons.

Readers of 'A Fresh Approach' are already familiar with the author's general views on Introduction. What he has to say on the subject in his Commentary is not simply a précis of what he has already written. Some of his main positions may

be briefly indicated. Like all contemporary scholars he allows for a large pre-exilic element in the Psalter, and he is emphatic that there are no Maccabæan Psalms. On the important question of the relation between the psalmody of Israel and that of Egypt and Babylonia, Dr. Oesterley notes the many obvious parallels. He recognizes that the Psalms belong to a world literature, but the marked differences, together with the similarities, point to 'adaptation rather than imitation' of foreign forms. The question of the 'Enthronement of Yahweh' Psalms, which is associated especially with the researches of the Norwegian scholar Mowinckel, is dealt with in one of the longest chapters in the Introduction. It seems probable that scholarship is approaching some sort of agreed conclusion on this subject. Dr. Oesterley is emphatic that there was no Festival of Yahweh's Enthronement as such, though he is equally certain that the Enthronement was the initial ceremony in the New Year Festival. The Psalms that embody it are, in their present form, post-exilic (*c.* 300 B.C.), by which time the cultus had been purged of its more primitive, and no doubt realistic, elements. Another chapter in the Introduction deals with the question of 'saints' and 'sinners' in the Psalms, and the conclusion reached is that these terms reflect party-strife going back to quite early times, and persisting into the Christian era in the antagonism between Sadducee (Zadokite) and Pharisee (*Hasidîm*). Finally, the 'Messianic' Psalms are pre-exilic, and refer to the reigning kings, though they later received a Messianic interpretation.

The name of the author makes it superfluous to commend this book. It is emphatically a book to be bought, even though one has to save up for it.

SAMUEL ALEXANDER.

In editing *Philosophical and Literary Pieces*, by the late Professor Samuel Alexander, O.M., and prefixing a Memoir (Macmillan; 15s. net), Professor Laird of Aberdeen has given us one of the best books of the kind we have ever read. The Memoir is a model of its kind. The career of Alexander was as interesting as his literary output was valuable and Professor Laird has achieved something quite unusual in his selection of material and its presentation. The Essays are chosen to illustrate the many-sided interests of Alexander, and will make wide appeal. The paper on 'The Mind of a Dog' will profoundly interest all dog-lovers as well as remain a sound chapter in animal psychology. Many will be interested to learn from 'Pascal the Writer' that that versatile thinker not only invented the omnibus but was the first to wear a wrist-watch. Literary critics will rejoice in the papers on Jane Austen, Dr. Johnson as Philosopher, Molière and Life. In addition, we have 'Art and Instinct,' 'Art and the Material,' 'Artistic Creation and Cosmic Creation,' and in more strictly philosophical vein papers on 'Value,' 'Spinoza,' Natural Piety,' and 'Theism and Pantheism.' Every single one of them was well worth reprinting, and together the essays constitute a very worth-while book.

EN-ROEH.

In *En-Roeh: The Prophecies of Isaiah the Seer with Habakkuk and Nahum* (T. & T. Clark; 14s. net) the Rev. W. A. Wordsworth, M.A., has presented the results of fourteen years' study of the Book of Isaiah, and his efforts have earned the right to public judgment. He holds the book to be a unity, and ascribes to Isaiah also other parts of the Old Testament, including a large element in the Psalter and the Book of Job. The author of Zech 9–14, Habakkuk and Nahum are contemporaries of Isaiah. The key to the prophet's work is to be found in his Messianic beliefs. Immanuel, typifying the Christ who was to come, sprang from the Nathan branch of the house of David, being born of a virgin (?) at some place in Galilee in 734 B.C. He was visited in his own home by Isaiah about 732, and the prophet recognized in him the fulfilment of hopes first raised in connexion with Uzziah. With other members of the northern community Immanuel was carried to Mesopotamia, where he spent the rest of his life. In and through the references to contemporary history Isaiah gives us an account of Immanuel's experiences in the land of his exile. Among other abnormal features in Mr. Wordsworth's presentation of history, we may note that, like Torrey (though on very different grounds), he eliminated Cyrus from chs. 44 f., and that he posits an invasion of Judah by Sennacherib, acting under Sargon's orders, in 709 B.C. It is hardly necessary to remark that this expedition appears to be unknown to the Assyrian annalists. But there are features of the work which deserve some attention. The author writes simply, modestly, and with a certain charm. His book consists mainly of a translation, with a short introduction to each chapter or section, and fairly extensive footnotes. He has a profound distrust of the Massoretic vocalization, and frequent doubt as to the correct division of words. Here he is not alone, and he feels free from time to time to adopt conjectural emendations made by other

scholars. Very often he gives alternative renderings, either in the text (in parenthesis) or in footnotes. Some of these he himself describes as 'curious,' but they do show a comprehensive knowledge of the Hebrew Lexicon. He has a keen sense of paranomasia, which he sometimes reproduces with success, though his rendering of the Tetragrammaton by 'Yeabe' hardly sounds dignified to English ears. Above all, Mr. Wordsworth is filled with a genuine evangelical passion, and his attitude may be summed up in one sentence from his Preface: 'He (Isaiah) saw not only the day of the Incarnate Christ, but the days of the Kingdom of His Spirit which is yet to come.'

THE HEREAFTER.

The Moorhouse Lectures for 1938 were delivered by the Rev. Charles Venn Pilcher, D.D., Bishop-Coadjutor of Sydney and formerly Professor of the New Testament in Wycliffe College in the University of Toronto. They are now published under the title *The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought* with special reference to the doctrine of Resurrection (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net).

Within very brief compass the author puts together the results of wide reading. He writes with crisp and lucid style which in a 'compressive' work of this kind is rather rare. He begins with a consideration of 'the Messiah,' carefully discussing the Old Testament data and illustrating the subject from ethnic conceptions. The second lecture deals with the Kingdom of God and is one of the best in the book. Then we get 'Hades, Hell, Paradise, and Judgment.' Then in three lectures we have discussions of Resurrection, in primitive thought and ethnic religions; in Jewish thought and the thought of our Lord; finally in Christian thought. In an Appendix we get an account of the hereafter in the Christian thought of mediæval Iceland.

It is a book which we can confidently recommend. The author is fully abreast of all the important literature of his subject and his own judgments are eminently sober. For the ordinary reader this book will suffice. For the scholar who desires fuller treatment it will be a good guide.

BRADLEY'S GIFFORD LECTURES.

Thirty-two years have elapsed since Professor Andrew C. Bradley delivered his Gifford Lectures in Glasgow. He meant to work them up for publication but bad health prevented his touching them. His sister, with the able assistance of Professor Joachim, so long as he lived, undertook as her brother's literary executrix to see the work through the Press and it now is in the hands of the public—*Ideals of Religion* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net). It was no easy task to which Mrs. de Glehn set her hand, for the lectures existed only in manuscript form not always easy to decipher. Nevertheless the wide circle who have learned to appreciate Bradley's work will be very grateful to have this memorial of him. Of many writers, even of some Gifford Lecturers, it would be true to say that a philosophical work of theirs, written more than thirty years ago—thirty years which have witnessed so many changes—could hardly be worth publishing. But Bradley is an exception. About all his work there was an objective 'time-less' quality which makes it permanently valuable. This work is still worth perusal, and like all the distinguished author's work will be found stimulating and in many respects satisfying. Specially valuable seems to us the chapter on 'The Inadequacy of Natural Religion'; in view of the rise of Barthianism it appears prophetic. The two chapters on 'Religious Ideas and Truth' are admirable.

SUFFERING.

The problem of suffering is a perennial one. It is raised for the individual by his own experience, and it is raised at such times as these by the terrible fact of war and its consequences. Such a book, therefore, as this of Principal H. Wheeler Robinson's—*Suffering, Human and Divine* (S.C.M.; 6s. net)—is very much to the point. Dr. Robinson himself raises the question how far a mere intellectual treatment of the problem is calculated to bring comfort to a sufferer. Perhaps he is right in setting a decisive limit to the answer. Job did not seem to get very much light on his difficulties from his argument with his friends. It was the manifestation of God that finally satisfied him. Yet it is true that what light is given us on the causes and probable results of suffering does bring help to the perplexed soul. And such light is really given us in the Bible. The answers to the problem in Proverbs, Job, the Psalms, and Second Isaiah, sealed by the Cross of Christ, present as much of a solution as we are likely to get on these lines. There does not seem to have been any substantial addition to it from the time of the Exile till to-day.

But Dr. Robinson's contribution in this book is a very real one. He goes over the whole ground with that competence which we expect from him. And in the end he concludes that the only adequate

solution to the problem is found in the faith that God suffers in us, with us, and for us. This lifts the problem above mere argument. By the aid of this faith the sufferer can face suffering in his own life or in the lives of others in a Christian experience for which the ultimate principle is '*Solvitur Patiendo*'—'live it through.'

This is a book for the times—for any time, but especially for this time—and we are grateful to its distinguished author for its wisdom, its comprehensive ability, and for its spiritual vision.

Many of the Hellenistic kings and great Roman governors were Stoics. The system comforted Brutus and Cato in the agonies of the Roman republic; it fortified the lame slave Epictetus; it inspired the good Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Its lofty spirit was never compromised.

Dr. Gilbert Murray has done a really good service in *Stoic, Christian and Humanist* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net) by helping the literary world to enter more sympathetically into the ethic of that great school which still has its contribution to make to Christian practice. The Levantine pagan of the first century might readily contest the historical statements of the faith of Christ. He would feel no surprise at the moral teaching. Stoicism had led him on the way.

It had a message of encouragement for those who seemed to fail. There are things that we must try to attain. Yet it is not really the *attainment* that matters; it is the seeking. Consequently in some sense the victory is with him who fought best, not with the man who happened to win. To use the phrase of Mr. Bevan, it is 'the Friend behind phenomena,' and our relation to Him that matter.

For students interested in Mystery Religions, concise and penetrating comments are made by the author on the somewhat disturbing facts which history reveals. In view of them how often we ask—Where then does Christianity come in? It is to be regretted that the writer, having led us so far by his fine exposition of the noble moral teaching of the classics, did not show the really confirmatory aid of such movements to the underlying needs of the soul, and the witness which they implicitly afford that satisfaction for such widespread needs is fully supplied in the teaching of Christ.

The Man from Heaven, by Mr. Alfred Cope Garrett (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net), is a book which merits the heartiest commendation. It is a life of Christ designed for the general reader, but it has a very distinctive character of its own. It is based on a solid foundation of critical scholarship but the writer wears his learning lightly. He makes good use of it, but is not burdened by it. He writes with fine imagination and insight and his narrative is above all interesting and indeed fascinating. He has succeeded in producing one of the most readable lives of Christ that can be found in English. There are no doubt points at which his imagination is overbold, as when he attempts to picture the Risen Christ emerging from the tomb, but usually his imagination is under strict control and throws a fine glow over the whole narrative. The writer accepts *ex animo* the full Christian position and his account of many of the miracles is persuasive, while his use of material from the Fourth Gospel does much to enrich and complete the story.

Whether we should remember the dead in our prayers is a question which at one time would have suggested sheer Romanism. But we have come to an understanding of prayer which robs the question of its menacing suggestions. The Rev. William White, M.A., B.D., has little difficulty in finding an affirmative answer to his question: *Should We Pray for the Departed?* (Allenson; 6d. net). The little book is an intelligent discussion of the subject which is of immediate interest to many at such a time as the present.

Thomas Bilney, one of the earliest of English reformers, was wont to meet with others at the White Horse Inn at Cambridge for the discussion of theological problems in the light of the new learning. After a varied career, of which little is known, he was burnt at the stake as a relapsed heretic. His copy of the Vulgate is in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. A brief but scholarly study of the man and of his book has been issued under the title of *On a Reformer's Latin Bible*, by the Rev. J. Y. Batley, M.A. (Deighton, Bell & Co.; 4s. net). It records such facts as are known about the man and gives samples of the annotations written on his copy of the Vulgate. There is not much here for the general reader but it is a useful bit of scholarly work which helps to throw light upon one section of a critical period of religious history in England.

A book of prayers and services, designed to help those who are suddenly called to conduct public worship in an emergency, has been compiled by the

Rev. Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press ; 3s. 6d. net). It bears the title *Before God's Throne.* In the first section are ten Orders of Service, each containing hymns and lessons grouped round a central theme. Facing each outline are prayers for use by those unaccustomed to praying in public. In the second section are ten complete services, including hymns, lesson, and a sermon. The prayers are simple, and, for the most part, unliturgical. There is a third section containing additional prayers, some for special occasions, others of a general character. Such a book is calculated to be of real value for its special purpose, and will be welcomed by those for whom, as above noted, it has been designed.

Dr. Church has also put together a series of extracts from various sources on various themes, leading up to a prayer, which he calls *A Pilgrim's Wallet* (Epworth Press ; 1s. net). It is a delightful little book and well deserves its attractive title. The subjects are such as these : Freedom, Hope, Depression, Fears, The Promises of God, Suffering. The Bible, R. L. S., Carlyle, St. Augustine, Oliver Wendell Holmes are a few among the many names drawn upon. The booklet can be carried in a waistcoat pocket, and may well cheer many a pilgrim on his way.

The Sparrow in the Sanctuary, by the Rev. E. H. Hobday (Epworth Press ; 4s. net), contains a series of twenty devotional studies based on Scripture texts. The writer has evidently read widely and makes full use of his reading. The result is a very interesting book abounding in illustrative quotations and helpful thoughts. A fine evangelical fervour pervades the whole and will make these studies a stimulus to Christian minds.

Creeds, it has been remarked, should be sung rather than said because they are the triumphant expression of the Church's faith. The Rev. Robert E. Roberts, D.D., who won his doctorate by a learned work on 'The Theology of Tertullian,' has written a valuable little book on *The Comfort of the Creeds* (Epworth Press ; 3s. net). In this he tells in a popular and interesting way why he is 'glad to affirm' the various articles of the Creed. An extract may best give some idea of the style and quality of the book. 'I am glad that "I believe in God the Father Almighty," because only so can I understand the strange ways of Providence. If God were a great King and nothing more, we should expect Him to keep better order in His Kingdom. . . . But with a father it is altogether different. You can say to a father, "Give me the portion of goods that is mine," and you can set off to Paris or the Riviera to have a good time without a thought of the heart-breaks or the added burdens you leave behind. . . . You can cause an awful amount of confusion and misery in a family and get away with it, where in a Kingdom you would be cast into prison.' Preachers will find here many suggestive thoughts and illustrations freshly put.

The Man Who is Different, by the Rev. E. D. Bebb, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press ; 4s. net), is a little book written in support of the thesis that Jesus is not as other men, but is in a unique sense divine. The writer bases his exposition upon the great sayings of our Lord and strives to convey the impressions He made on men by His words and works and His whole personality. The language used is, as far as possible, untechnical, as may be seen from the titles of some of the chapters, such as the Man who floodlights the world, the Man who provides imperishable food, the Man who is a main road, etc. The writer is the master of a clear and interesting style, and presents a deal of gospel truth in a fresh and persuasive way.

So many books have been written about the Kingdom of God that it must require some hardihood to add to the number. The subject, however, is so eternally fresh and vital that Christian men cannot well forbear returning to it again and again. In *Thy Kingdom Come* (Independent Press ; 3s. 6d. net), the Rev. J. R. Ackroyd, B.D., gives us 'a series of Bible studies in Christ's teaching about the Kingdom of God.' It takes the form of about thirty very brief chapters based on passages in the Synoptic Gospels. Such topics are treated as the Background of the Kingdom, the Warranty of the Kingdom, its Essence, its Form, its Texture. The treatment on each topic is too brief to be adequate, but the writing is thoughtful and instructive, and the style is simple.

Miss Evelyn Underhill, D.D., has written a series of meditations based upon the Lord's Prayer, and it is issued under the title *Abba* (Longmans ; 2s. 6d. net). Anything that comes from Miss Underhill is welcome, for all her writings are characterized by a combination of two qualities not always found together, intellectual keenness and devout simplicity. This little book is a benediction in both these respects. The writer makes clear to us the real spiritual structure of the Prayer. But on the basis of this understanding she has let her spirit range

into regions where we feel in contact with a living faith and a vision that helps us to see a little more clearly what most of us are feeling after.

The Archbishop of York has issued the second volume of his *Readings in St. John's Gospel* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net), which completes the commentary. Following as it does so soon after the first volume it calls for no extended notice. The writer has seen fit to repeat the Introduction for the benefit of those who have not read it in the former volume. In it he gives a careful comparison of the Synoptic and Johannine pictures of Christ. His contention is 'that there is no incompatibility between the Synoptic and the Johannine portraits, because the Synoptic portrait is substantially Johannine.' The bulk of the book is occupied with a running commentary on chs. 13–21. It is not a critical commentary but is designed to give the reader a share in the writer's thoughts as he meditates on the Gospel for the nourishment of his own spiritual life. It may be said there is more 'spirit and life' in it than in most commentaries. We feel as we read that we are in the company of a thoughtful and deeply Christian mind.

'For over a quarter of a century Charlotte Baptist Chapel, Edinburgh, has sent out monthly Gospel tracts.' The series for 1939 has now been issued by the Rev. J. Sidlow Baxter under the title, *Enter Ye In* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. net). The tracts are excellent representatives of the Spurgeon tradition, strongly evangelical, vigorous, and outspoken (sometimes barely avoiding mere abuse), with frequent reference to present conditions, but transfused with a burning passion for the souls of men. It may well be that this method of presenting the gospel will once more become effective, and, if so, Mr. Baxter's work should prove to be of real value.

For theological students a course of reading of Wesley's Diary might well be recommended. A beginning may be made with Miss Nora Ratcliff's edition of *The Journal of John Wesley* (Nelson; 6s. net), which includes much that is essential to a knowledge of the man. It gives piquant sayings that unveil human nature. It sheds light on debated points on preaching. It reveals what a consecrated life may accomplish, even when youth has faded. It displays the reading interests of a busy evangelist—for example, Homer, Pascal, and Burke. It unfolds the story of widely planned tours, and the triumphs of one of the real saints of Christendom. Incidentally, too, this eighteenth-century figure discloses his common-sense view of Church organization. The mere record of that insight into the cause of congregational difficulties would shield many a young minister from unseen difficulties in the way. Augustine Birrell's Introduction to the Diary may never be superseded, yet we are in wise and skilful hands if we accept the guidance of Miss Ratcliff in her Preface and Biographical Notes. These Journals are often referred to as models of English prose style. In so far as style consists of saying what we mean as simply and clearly as possible, then Wesley indeed is past master. He never wastes a word nor over-elaborates a phrase.

In her summaries, and in the selective process applied, Miss Ratcliff has been successful. If this man saved Europe from a French Revolution there are other fruits of his genius. The reading of this abridgment may greatly help to a more dedicated service in the Church, and may redeem many a ministry from that lack of adventure which endangers spiritual weal.

The Rev. W. M. Christie, D.D., is one of the best-known and most highly esteemed of our foreign missionaries. He has been for many years stationed in Palestine, and is one of the most reliable, as well as one of the most capable, authorities on the Holy Land and its problems. His latest book, *Palestine Calling* (Pickering & Inglis; 6s. net), contains discussions of many matters of interest connected with the land and its people. His knowledge of the Bible and of the country are equally conspicuous in these chapters, which were originally published as articles in The Expository Times and other journals. Titles of some of the articles are: 'The Early Days of the Lord Jesus,' 'A Man I want to meet—Cestius Gallus,' 'Was the Crucifixion on Friday?' 'Some Bible Names,' 'Trades and Occupations in Palestine.' It will be apparent that to all lovers of the Bible this book will provide a fund both of interest and instruction.

Much has been written, and justly, about the educational value of the moving picture. But the fact remains that the still picture has a value of its own and can be adapted more easily to oral instruction. This is particularly true of religious instruction which calls for an atmosphere of restfulness and quiet. The Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly evidently believe this, for they continue to supply excellent sets of lantern lectures. Their most recent is *The Story of St. Paul and the Early Church*, by the Rev. Dr. Charles W.

Budden. There are three lectures dealing with St. Paul's Conversion and Call, His Missionary Journeys, and the Gospel carried to Rome. Each is illustrated by about forty pictures. The selection of topics is admirable, and the notes given make up a most interesting description of them.

This Way to Peace (Rich & Cowan; 3s. net), by Mr. George Lansbury is, as many readers would anticipate, a simple and sincere exposition of the argument that war never has settled anything, nor can it, nor will it settle anything; an exposition, moreover, from the Socialist, Pacifist, and Christian standpoint. Socialism is interpreted as Co-operation, Pacifism as Passive Resistance, and Christianity as Good Neighbourliness. The book was projected and largely written before the war, and alterations have even had to be made before the passing of the proofs. For example, Mr. Lansbury intimates his intention of appealing to Joseph Stalin, among others, to call a Conference, with or without the Belligerents, for the purpose of discussing and formulating terms of peace. But in the next sentence he has to note (and he does so without comment) that Russia is now among the Belligerents. It is the merit, however, of Mr. Lansbury's book that it does not advocate mere passive resistance but would summon people in all lands to follow the way of Co-operation as being the way of life.

One Generation and Another, by Mr. Robert Russell Wicks (Scribner's; 6s. net), is a book on family life by a very wise, shrewd, and widely experienced man, who is Dean of the Chapel of Princeton University. He has had wide contacts with youth and with their homes. And here he gives us the result of his observation and experience. His book might be called 'How to make the home stable and happy.' He prefers to call it 'Handing on a Family Tradition,' and, properly understood, that is the gist of a volume that would help to make, and keep, the family tradition sane, pure, and loving. There is enough wisdom in this book to float many voyagers into the haven of a secure peace. We commend it to all home-makers and home-seekers.

The books of the Apocrypha are little known to the general reader, though their value both in themselves and for the light they throw on the New Testament is well known to scholars. An attempt to popularize them is made in *Readings from the Apocrypha*, selected and translated by the Rev. Prebendary W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. (Sheldon Press; 3s. 6d. net). The translator has followed generally the Revised Version, but in the case of Ecclesiasticus he has made use of the Hebrew text which had not been discovered when the Revised Version was made. He has included seventy-four brief readings in all. These are selected with care and skill and are fitted to give a very fair idea of the contents and style of the Apocrypha. The hope is expressed that these readings may be of use in schools, and for this they are singularly fitted.

Unity in the Truth (S.P.C.K.; 1s. net) is an examination by the Rev. A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., of the 'Outline of a Reunion Scheme for the Church of England and the Evangelical Free Churches of England.' Mr. Hebert stresses the need for the reunion of Christendom, but insists that any scheme of reunion must be based on a sound foundation in 'the theology of the Mystical Body and of the Church.' It is his main criticism of the 'Outline' that it would solve the problem of Reunion on the basis of the practical need, whereas it can be solved only on a theological basis. If it were to succeed in healing one set of schisms, it could only do so at the cost of producing a fresh set. Its adoption would cause a 'big split' in the Church of England.

Holy Moscow (S.P.C.K.; cloth 4s. 6d. net, paper 2s. 6d. net), by Mr. Nicholas Arseniev offers some chapters on the religious and spiritual life of Russia in the nineteenth century. In that century the Russian Church was too greatly dependent on the State; yet at the same time it enshrined a religious experience so rich and authentic as to be the source, often hidden no doubt, of much of the contemporary Russian culture. Of this last point Moscow, now the centre of the Bolshevik atheistic revolution, is more than an illustration; it fostered some of the greatest achievements of Russian culture. It fostered in particular the thought of Ivan Kireyevsky and Alexei Khomyakov. And the author of this book sees in Moscow the centre also of a new life of the Spirit which comes forth from the blood of the new martyrs of the Russian Church. He claims indeed that Moscow's greatest title to glory perhaps is that while it became the centre of the most aggressive atheism, it has by the same process become the centre of a new bloody martyrdom: it is a new Rome—of martyrs, but with no catacombs.

Mr. R. R. Williams, M.A., begins his treatise *Religion and the English Vernacular* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. 6d. net) by portraying the mediæval background. He shows the defective methods of inculcating

piety then, as witnessed by Chaucer's portraiture. He records the inability of the curates either in learning or teaching. From the Prologue to 'The Canterbury Tales' the general standards of the Church may be deduced. In the long procession of ecclesiastical figures only one or two employed usefully their spiritual functions. The more marked then is the influence and potency of the New Learning. The deeper too seems the impressiveness of the labours of Erasmus, Luther, Tyndale, and the rest. The creative impulses are well defined by Mr. Williams. There is a commendable care in his many historical references and his learning is marked not alone in this but in his wide bibliography. His thesis is that in the context of the living experience of one's fellow-men the Bible comes with its greatest power. Students will find in this volume a helpful store of information, and pathways for further research.

Canon Ronald Sinclair, M.C., stresses the view that the Crucifixion is the very heart of the Christian message, and the root of preaching to meet man's need is the evangel. Force is only destructive, at best preventive. It cannot redeem society as may Jesus, if given His chance.

In a book of Lenten sermons, *Victim Victorious* (S.C.M.; 3s. net), Canon Sinclair elaborates his brief. His message is appropriate, if often neglected in war time. Christian truth is important, although more in relation to what Christ did than what He said. One of the deterrents to its acceptance is the unforgiving temper of man to man. Yet to-day God has appeared in His descent to the depths. In the Cross lies the promise of the penitent's recovery. Readers of these addresses are reminded of Bernard Shaw's recent play, 'Geneva,' where the somewhat ironic hint is given that nations deem the dictum of our Lord on forgiveness too simple for man to stoop to adopt! Although the exultant note is evangelic in these pages, there is a lack of solid reasoning, or distinction in the style. We feel that if the marvel of the preacher's spiritual commission is truly to hold, or fully to stimulate his fellow-craftsmen and to lay a spell on his waiting congregation, he should covet a magnetic charm in his language.

Some incidental addresses delivered in America by the Archbishop of York have been published by the Student Christian Movement Press—*Christianity in Thought and Practice* (2s. 6d. and 1s. net). They are not lengthy enough for his usually expansive treatment and in consequence they suffer. Yet to the student of philosophy they open suggestive avenues of investigation, and not least in the metaphysician's deeper sympathy with a religious standpoint, however lacking he may yet be in final evidence. The man of science does not wait to form a hypothesis which seems likely to help in co-ordination and control. Does the philosopher always follow his example? Is not the way to the practice of Christian ethics through faith and worship? There are sidelines in these short studies of the Archbishop—a fine insistence on the worth of conscience, and hints as to the carrying out of the Christian's witness on the field of life. His admirers always feel that to ask him to compress is to weaken the profundity with which his massive mind approaches his theme. Like the Peripatetic School, this Churchman requires room to walk.

A very useful handbook for higher grade pupils has been issued by the S.C.M. Press (5s. net) on *The Gospel of St. John*, by Mr. R. F. Bailey, M.A. It is commended in a Foreword by the Bishop of Liverpool, but its own excellence is its best commendation. In his Preface the writer, who is Headmaster of Quarry Bank High School, Liverpool, says: 'The many difficulties connected with the Fourth Gospel have led, I believe, to its systematic study being too often omitted from Christian education, and this is one reason why the real beliefs of many young people about the Person of Jesus are much more Unitarian than they realize.' An admirable Introduction of forty pages deals with the Environment, the Plan and Style, and the Leading Ideas of the Gospel. The commentary itself is in the form of a free translation interspersed with explanatory notes. The development of the action is vividly set forth and the leading thoughts and symbolism of the Gospel are lucidly explained. It is a fine piece of work by one who is not only a well-equipped Christian thinker but an experienced teacher who knows how to teach.

Blood, Bread, and Fire, by the Rev. Vance Havner (Zondervan Publishing House; $1.00), contains a dozen sermons which have already appeared in various American magazines. The title is very suggestive of the contents of the book. Here is little teaching or quiet reasoning, but bold appeal and fervent evangelism. The writer has a robust style which will impress some but leave others cold. Yet these latter must not forget that it is the passion of the prophet rather than the cold reasoning of the philosopher that moves the world.

Mark's Gospel and Paulinism.[1]

By Herbert G. Wood, Selly Oak, Birmingham.

At the turn of the century we were still wedded in England, or at least in Cambridge, to the Marcan hypothesis. The labour of two generations of scholars had established beyond question the priority of Mark, and we treated our earliest source with a confidence that has since been severely shaken. We thought of Mark as a naïve unreflecting reporter faithfully handing on the most primitive tradition derived from Peter and other eye-witnesses. Disregarding the warning of Papias that Mark wrote down things accurately but not in order, we thought we could trace a clear development in the narrative of the earliest Gospel, and the Johannine concept of a three-year ministry was abandoned for a framework derived from Mark. But during the last thirty years there has been a signal reversal of judgment and a strong tendency to disparage Mark as a historical witness. Johannes Weiss reminded us of a fact that should never have been forgotten, the fact that Mark is not primarily biographer or historian, but evangelist. The purpose of his Gospel does not differ from the explicit aim of the Fourth Gospel. He writes to persuade his readers to believe in the Son of God, that believing they may have life through His name. The simple contrast of Mark as faithful remembrancer and John as mystical interpreter cannot be sustained. Then K. L. Schmidt, and A. E. J. Rawlinson in his Westminster Commentary, drew attention to the artificiality and untrustworthiness of Mark's order, to the conventionality and looseness of the connecting links between one incident and another, one saying and another. Confusion is apparent in ch. 4, where a private conversation with the disciples and the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower interrupt the account of a continuous address to the multitude by the seashore. The confusion is undeniable, and such confusion is held to be typical. Then it is difficult not to believe that the evangelist has treated two traditions regarding the same event, the feeding of the multitude, as evidence for two distinct events. A repetition of an incident such as the feeding of the multitude is in itself highly improbable. But more far-reaching still has been the analysis of the Gospel presented to us first and independently by Bacon and Loisy and developed later by the protagonists of Form-Criticism, Dibelius and Bultmann, many of whose principles and results have been admirably expounded and skilfully developed in Dr. R. H. Lightfoot's Bampton Lectures on *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. These critics all contend that the traditions at Mark's disposal had already been shaped by the needs of the primitive churches, Palestinian and Hellenistic, and that the evangelist himself is guided in the selection and presentation of his material by definite doctrinal and church interests. Loisy more extravagantly, Bacon and Bultmann more cautiously, maintain that these doctrinal interests are primarily Pauline. 'Mark,' says Loisy, 'may have been the disciple of St. Paul. In any case he is a great admirer or rather a great partisan of St. Paul. We may say that his book is a Pauline interpretation, a consciously Pauline interpretation of the more primitive gospel tradition.' For Bacon, 'the Paulinism of Mark appears in the selection and adaptation of material, the omissions counting even more than the inclusions. It is not a matter of borrowed words and phrases, but is supremely manifest in this evangelist's whole conception of what constitutes the apostolic message.' Bacon stresses the indirect influence of Paul on Mark through the earlier shaping of the tradition in Hellenistic churches; Bultmann, like Loisy, is more ready to assert Mark's conscious Paulinism. 'The author's intention was to unite the Hellenistic preaching of the Christ, whose content is the Christ-mythos, as we learn it from Paul (Ph $2^{6ff.}$ and Ro $3^{24f.}$) with the traditions about the history of Jesus.' Our earliest Gospel is then to be regarded as a radical reinterpretation of the traditions of the

[1] A Paper read to the Oxford Society of Historical Theology.

ministry of Jesus under the influence if not in the interests of St. Paul and Pauline Christianity.

Before I attempt to expound and examine this thesis further, I had best outline my present attitude towards the findings of Form-Criticism, and also the general conclusions to which I invite attention in this article.

First, I take it for granted that Mark is essentially evangelist rather than biographer, but I am not prepared to follow Dibelius in apparently excluding any biographical or psychological interests from Mark's original sources, or in assuming that such interests when they emerge must be indicative of a comparatively late stage in the handling of the material. I am not, of course, denying that a popular interest in biographical or more often pseudo-biographical detail is a sign of second-generation and even of second-century Christianity. But I do not believe that the graphic detail of some of Mark's stories can be explained as a sign of such a secondary popular interest. There are details of biographic interest in Mark, which are omitted or ignored by Luke who is recognized to be more consciously a historian or biographer than Mark is, and such details may still be rightly regarded as evidence of the primitive and first-hand character of many of the traditions at Mark's disposal.

Secondly, I assume that Mark's order must be viewed cautiously and must be recognized as largely artificial, and as untrustworthy in detail. But on the other hand, no narrative of the ministry of Jesus could have been constructed without some conception of the development of events from the baptism of John to the Crucifixion and Resurrection. That Mark had such a conception and that he based it on actual historic tradition, or at least on an estimate of historic probabilities and not primarily on literary (*i.e.* dramatic) or doctrinal considerations, I at present firmly believe. His details of time and place may be conjectural save where they inhere in earlier traditions; but even his own editorial passages like the introduction to the Galilean ministry itself in 1^{14-15}, seem to me to enshrine genuine historical reminiscence. That Jesus opened His ministry in Galilee after John was put in prison reads as a simple statement of fact in which it is unnecessary to look for doctrinal significance. I see no reason to question Mark's apparent distinction of two stages in the Galilean ministry, or his assertion that the final appeal to Jerusalem was preceded by a period in which Jesus sought to be alone with His disciples and to avoid publicity.

In the third place, I recognize that apart from a connected story of the Passion, it is probable that most of Mark's material came to his hands as detached incidents and teachings. I recognize also the debt we owe to Dibelius and Bultmann for their analysis and classification of the material that goes to make up the Synoptic tradition. Bultmann's elaborate classification of the sayings attributed to Jesus has a real value, even for those who dissent from his appraisals in detail. Dibelius' distinction between Paradigms and Novellen, *i.e.* between short stories whose point lies in some pregnant saying of Jesus and longer tales which show more interest in the descriptive detail, has also real value, though I dissent from Dibelius' estimate of their relative originality. To make the point somewhat clearer, let me add another word or two. The typical Paradigm, or pronouncement-story as Vincent Taylor calls it, is a brief, sermon illustration culminating in an edifying saying or comment on a saying. Such incidents as are recorded in ch. 2 are taken as typical Paradigms. The Novellen or Tales are best exemplified by the stories in ch. 5—the healing of the Gadarene demoniac and the raising of Jairus' daughter. They betray, according to Dibelius, the art of the story-teller. They are relatively secular and characterized by the lack of devotional motives and the gradual retreat of any words of Jesus of general value. Dibelius also detects in these stories an approximation to the literature of the world, assimilation to the miracle-stories current in the Græco-Roman world. He tends to treat them as a class as secondary. The connexion of Paradigms with preaching seems to him to guarantee their primitive character and to have protected them against unhistorical extensions and other corruptions. On this I would only remark that no doubt the connexion with the first preaching of the Gospel points to the early origin of such stories, but early Christian preaching must have been very different from later pulpit oratory if

it really protected these illustrations against unhistorical extensions and corruptions! But as to Novellen, I would not agree with Dibelius that as a class they are secondary. He suggests somewhere that these longer tales were developed out of Paradigms by skilful story-tellers. I see no reason why Paradigms should not be abbreviated Novellen rather than Novellen expanded Paradigms. But I do not see why the two types in their best examples may not be equally early, equally original, and equally trustworthy. The ministry of healing is as primitive as the ministry of the word. The exorcist and the evangelist worked side by side and the functions were often united in the same person. Origen tells us that when asked to drive out demons, Christians would read stories from the Gospels and then pray. I have no doubt that some of these more descriptive stories of healing belong to the earliest proclamation of the Gospel. The narrative of the raising of Jairus' daughter is as primitive as any of the Paradigms. To sum up, the classifications of material proposed by Bultmann and Dibelius are of real value. Their appraisals of the relative worth of different types and their judgments on particular stories and sayings require careful critical scrutiny, and many of them will not survive a close examination.

In turning now to the discussion of the alleged Pauline influence in Mark, I would like to advance some theses of this kind. First, that while Mark is certainly an evangelist, the extent to which he is consciously moulding the primitive tradition in the interests of some form of Christology has been very much exaggerated in recent critical work on his Gospel. Second, that not only in comparison with the other three evangelists is Mark relatively more naïve, unreflective and objective, but this relative naïveté which is part of the proof of his priority is also something positive, which forbids the discovery of subtle doctrinal considerations in simple statements. In this connexion Dibelius might pay more attention to his own admission that 'Mark is often one who hands down, not one who moulds.' Third, where modern critics discover an element of interpretation, or conscious theory, in Mark, the evangelist is often only generalizing from his sources and not introducing anything new. Fourth, where modern critics discover an element of interpretation in Mark, the motive and character of the interpretation are usually much simpler and less subtle than they realize.

With these theses in mind, let us then return to the case presented by Loisy and Bacon and the Form-critics. Loisy summarizing his position in a footnote [1] puts first the traits detrimental to the Galilean apostles, the many passages which reflect on the failure of the Twelve to understand, and second he cites certain matters of doctrine, the providential hardening of the Jewish people, the idea of the redemptive nature of Christ's death as a ransom for many, the mystical conception of the Last Supper. For Loisy and Bultmann, Mark is trying consciously to link the primitive tradition of the ministry of Jesus with the Pauline Christ-mythos and the Christian mystery. The link, according to Bultmann, is the theory of the Messianic secret. In the primitive tradition Jesus reveals His true nature in word and deed, but Mark presents the story as a series of veiled epiphanies or rather of epiphanies deliberately suppressed by Jesus. This is apparently to emphasize the lowliness of the earthly life of Jesus in accordance with the Pauline view that the divine Christ emptied Himself and made Himself of no reputation, being found in fashion as a man and in the form of a slave. There are other aspects of the theory of the Messianic secret, which Dibelius brings out. 'To the evangelist, the life of Jesus as a whole is only comprehensible on the assumption that Jesus intentionally kept His real status secret. He was the Son of God, but He did not reveal to the people who He was. This is the reason why He could be so much misunderstood and even sent to the Cross.' Dibelius associates with the Messianic secret, Mark's conception of the parables as mysteries.

We are asked then to suppose that Mark is combining the Pauline conception of the humility of Christ's earthly ministry with a record concerned with His deeds of power and His teaching with authority, and that Mark is also trying to account for the failure of the Jews to recognize Jesus as the Christ. The explanation is twofold: that Jesus deliberately concealed His glory and His status,

[1] Cf. *La Naissance du Christianisme*, 51, n. 3.

and that He taught by parables so that the Jews were providentially blinded. 'In this way, the Gospel of Mark was written as a book of secret epiphanies. Both the Paradigms and the Tales can be brought under this heading.'

I do not believe the case so presented will stand a critical examination. Let us begin with the treatment meted out to the Apostles. References to them in Mark are almost uniformly disparaging. Loisy sees in this an echo of Paul's struggle for recognition at Jerusalem. 'At the relatively early date when our gospel acquired its present form, the feeling of the struggles which Paul had had to undertake in order to get the Galilean Apostles to accept or tolerate what he called his gospel, had not yet been effaced and men were still aware of the distance which separated the Jewish-Christian conception from the Pauline conception of Christ's mission. It is this feeling which breaks through in Mark in a manner that is almost offensive and that appeared offensive to later evangelists. The mystery of salvation which had been offered to the Jews only for their blinding was necessarily described as having been given to the immediate disciples of Jesus, but they had received it like a sealed treasure of which they had no understanding. And the truth they did not understand, the evangelist tells us, was the heart of the mystery, the unique importance of the death of Jesus for the salvation of mankind. These pillar-apostles, these arch-apostles of whom their followers were so proud and whom they set in opposition to Paul who had not known Christ—these apostles had never understood their Master, and this was true of Peter their leader and of James and John the sons of Zebedee.' 'One could not rigorously condemn their failure, but it was not necessary any longer to conceal the truth. Such seems to be the general trend of the Second Gospel, and in consequence this book can never have been written by a disciple of Peter.'

If this characterization stands, Mark is certainly no disciple of Peter. Yet Loisy admits that however early the Gospel assumed its present definite form, Peter and James certainly, and John possibly, had already suffered martyrdom for the truth. What likelihood is there that the memory of conflicts with Paul would be an active force in shaping a tradition which, it is also admitted, derived from the Galilean apostles or their immediate disciples? Why should Mark pursue a vendetta against Peter on behalf of Paul when both were dead and when their conflict had been for long composed? If he is intentionally drawing an unflattering portrait of the original apostles, the doctrinal motive might be found where Wrede finds it, in the endeavour to establish the thesis of Barnabas that Jesus deliberately chose very bad men to be His disciples. Or if Pauline influence is to be sought, perhaps the evangelist is establishing in the case of the apostles, the truth that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. I believe, however, that these suggestions are as irrelevant and baseless as Loisy's. Assuming that the evangelist has some purpose in so presenting the apostles, his purpose would be sufficiently explained if we recognize that they thus serve as a foil to the Central Figure. Mark is contrasting the Galilean apostles not with Paul but with their Master. But I doubt even this amount of conscious bias and artistic interpretation.

Loisy has overlooked the following considerations which seem to me to militate against his thesis:

(*a*) Many of these references to the limitations of the disciples and many of the rebukes administered by Jesus already belong to the original traditions which Mark is handling, and cannot therefore be attributed to him, or be evidence of his conscious bias. Note especially 4^{38-41} 5^{30-31} 10^{13-16}.

(*b*) In Mark, these references to the disciples are associated with references to Jesus which are manifestly naïve and unreflective. Again note 5^{30-31} and 10^{13-16}.

(*c*) Mark in describing the failure of the disciples to understand, emphasizes also the beginnings of faith expressed in reverential awe. The meaning of 'fear' in 4^{41} (cf. Jon 1^{10}) 10^{32} and 16^{8} is probably best understood in this way.

(*d*) There are also references to the disciples of a trivial biographical character, 1^{29} $3^{16.\ 17}$ 6^{31}.

(*e*) There are suggestions of the same relation of Jesus to would-be disciples in Q, *i.e.* in Lk 9^{57-62}, and in the narrative peculiar to Luke (9^{51-56}), James and John are rebuked as sternly as in any incident in Mark.

These considerations are to my mind conclusive against the suggestion that Mark is reading into the Judæo-Christian tradition this way of portraying the first disciples and their relation to their Master. In this, Mark is discovered to be one who hands down, not one who moulds. And if in some probably editorial passages, *e.g.* 8^{14-21}, the same trait appears, Mark is still only repeating the brief supplied to him, not adding elements to it. I would suggest that this characteristic feature of Mark's narrative is evidence of the primitive apostolic nature of the traditions on which it is based. If, however, Mark's enlargement or over-emphasis of the dullness of the Twelve is to be attributed to conscious purpose, I would prefer the view that he uses the disciples as a foil to their Master [1] to the view that he is writing as a partisan of Paul.

We must next consider the more important suggestions that Mark's whole conception of what constitutes the Gospel derives from St. Paul, and that the character of his narrative is determined by his attempt to link the primitive Judæo-Christian tradition with the Christ-mythos of St. Paul or the Christological preaching of the Hellenistic Pauline churches. Mark's omissions are held to be significant in this connexion, particularly his scanty record of the teaching of Jesus. Is he not influenced here by Paul's concentration on preaching Christ crucified, to the neglect of all that Jesus said or did during His earthly ministry? Mark's narrative is dominated by the story of the Passion. Almost from the start of the public ministry, when John is put in prison, our minds are being prepared for the Son of Man to be rejected and put to death. The hints become ever stronger, from the reference to the bridegroom in ch. 2 to the open predictions of passion to the Twelve in chs. 8, 9, 10. Does not this reflect Paul's determination to know nothing and to preach nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified? Is not the idea of Christ's death as a ransom for many in line with and derived from Paul's doctrine of atonement? And is not Loisy right after all in saying that the Galilean apostles are represented as failing to understand the mystery of the Cross, which was the heart of the gospel to Paul? Undoubtedly there is some weight in these suggestions, but they are subject to a considerable discount. It is agreed that a narrative of the arrest, trial, and death of Jesus formed part of the earliest tradition. It may have been part of the preached gospel, or it may have been more closely associated with worship and the devotional life of those early communities. But in any case, the Cross was no monopoly of St. Paul's, and the gospel of the Cross was not a Pauline invention. From the first, the story of the Cross was in the centre of the Church's interest, and the interpretation of the death of Christ as a ransom is derived from Is 53 and is pre-Pauline. That Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures is on Paul's own evidence a common Christian conviction, not a Pauline peculiarity. I cannot discern in Mark any trace of Paul's more distinctive interpretations of the meaning of Christ's death. Paul saw in the Cross the end of the Law, redemption from the Law, but it is not in that sense that Christ's death as a ransom is interpreted in Mk 10. Mark is on Paul's side in asserting the liberty of Gentile Christians from Jewish food-laws, but he bases this freedom not on deliverance from the Law through Christ's death, but on a particular teaching of Christ making all meats clean. Any one who set out to make a connected narrative from detached sayings and incidents, a narrative which has to lead up to the story of the Cross, was bound to make some links between the earlier part of the story and its close. Is there any ground for supposing that a non-Pauline Mark would have done less than Mark has done to prepare the way for the climax of his story in his selection of earlier material? As to the failure of the disciples to understand the predictions of the Passion, is that not perfectly natural if the predictions are historical? If they are not, why should a partisan of Paul try to make a point of the failure of the disciples to understand the event before it happened, when Paul himself had stumbled at the Cross after it had happened? But I would stress the point that the predictions of the Passion should not be dismissed as unhistorical. No doubt as they stand they are summaries betraying an editorial hand; but if Mark has worded these

[1] Cf. Bultmann, p. 368.

predictions in his own terms, he had good ground for believing that Jesus anticipated and foretold His rejection and suffering and future triumph. For he found such anticipations in his sources (*e.g.* in 2^{20} 6^{4} 9^{11-13} 9^{19} 10^{35-45} 12^{1-12} 14^{8}, and I should add other passages, such as 3^{6} which may be part of the original incident and not Mark's addition as Dibelius and Bultmann assume). In the predictions, as in his other summaries, Mark does not proceed without warrant in his sources and goes little beyond what he found in his sources. Moreover, similar anticipatory hints are found in Q (Lk $6^{22.\ 23}$ 9^{58} 10^{3} $10^{13-15.\ 16}$ $11^{29.\ 30.\ 32}$ $11^{47f.}$ $12^{4.\ 5}$ $12^{49.\ 50}$ $13^{34.\ 35}$ 14^{27}). In general, I submit that if the predictions of the Passion are editorial and in their wording coloured by the actual subsequent events, yet the representation of Jesus as anticipating rejection conforms to simple historic fact.

What then of the assertion that Mark is trying to combine the Pauline Christ-mythos with the primitive Judæo-Christian tradition? The so-called Christ-mythos consists of a kind of divine dialectic movement. The divine Christ pre-exists in heavenly glory; this is the thesis; He appears on earth in all humility which issues in a shameful death; this is the antithesis: the Resurrection is a kind of synthesis, whereby Christ returns to a glory enhanced by His humiliation and obedience unto death. Is Mark really weaving this conception into a more primitive tradition? I receive this suggestion with the utmost reserve, especially since Bultmann himself writes, 'the only essential feature of the Christus-mythos which Mark has not yet adopted is the pre-existence of Jesus.' But you cannot adopt a Christology of this kind piecemeal. If Mark has not adopted this essential feature of the Christus-mythos, it is improbable that he has adopted any of it.[1] I see little or no trace of the influence of the Christology of Ph 2 on Mark's Gospel. Even Mk 10^{45} exhibits no trace of Ph $2^{7.\ 8}$, since according to Dibelius[2] the form of a slave is a purely God-ward relation, while Mk 10^{45} contemplates the service of man. And if Mark is not combining this Christology with a more primitive tradition, the suggestion that he effects the combination by the theory of the Messianic secret falls to the ground.

The other suggestions regarding the Messianic secret are more attractive though still to my mind unsatisfactory. Dibelius sees in this theory Mark's explanation of the rejection of Jesus by the Jews. They should have been convinced by the words and deeds of Jesus. Why were they not converted? 'Mark replies to this question with a theory. He reports that Jesus forbade both demons and men to bear witness to His power and majesty. Again and again he makes Jesus utter the command not to speak of His true dignity. In this way Mark explains the fact that Jesus was rejected by His own people.' Does he? If this is part of his answer to the question propounded, it is only a small part. He accounts for the rejection of Jesus by the Sabbath-controversy, and by the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen. He accounts for it by an appeal to Scripture especially to Is $6^{9.\ 10}$ in ch. 4^{12}. He has no need to offer any other explanation. His explanation in terms of history is clear enough from 3^{6} and from the narrative of Passion-week. His explanation in terms of theory is contained in the quotation from Isaiah. Why should he invent another theory, the injunction to silence, when he had answered the question already? Moreover, the theory is no answer. The Jews did not reject Jesus because He concealed or tried to conceal His true dignity. According to Mark Jesus could not be hid. His attempts to conceal His true dignity failed, and at the close He ceased to make them. Jesus was rejected and put to death as a Messianic claimant, and not because He kept His Messianic claim a secret. The 'theory' which is supposed to answer the question, why Jesus was rejected, is both unnecessary and irrelevant. It might explain why the Crucifixion did not happen earlier; it does not help at all to explain why the Crucifixion eventually took place.

The significance which Wrede and Bultmann find in the Messianic secret in Mark's Gospel seems even more improbable. These scholars hold that the

[1] Possibly Mark has accepted pre-existence, and does not stand for an Adoption Christology. If so, his reserve in emphasizing his Christology is noteworthy.

[2] Dibelius, *Gospel Criticism and Christology*. See also Werner's admirable and careful treatise on Paulinism in Mark's Gospel on this and other points.

disciples did not recognize Jesus as the Messiah until after the Resurrection. In one sense this is a truism. The Resurrection finally established their faith in Jesus as the Christ. But Wrede and Bultmann hold that before His death and resurrection the disciples never thought of Jesus as more than a Rabbi. To answer the question, Why did they not recognize Jesus as the Christ earlier? Mark answers by saying, 'Oh, but they did. Peter confessed his faith in the Messiahship of Jesus at Cæsarea Philippi, but Jesus forbade him to say anything until after the Resurrection.' So we must regard both the confession and the injunction to silence as fictions, parts of a theory to answer a difficult question. But if on Dibelius' view the theory of the Messianic secret was found to be an unnecessary and irrelevant answer to a question, at least the question, 'Why did the Jews reject Jesus?' was a real question, a question which was asked in the Early Church and which needed an answer. On Bultmann's view, however, the Messianic secret was the answer to a question which so far as we know was never asked. Bultmann assumes that Jesus did not regard Himself as the Messiah, and that the disciples did not regard Him as Messiah until after the Resurrection. If these assumptions correspond with historic facts, the question, Why did not the disciples recognize Jesus earlier?—the question to which the Messianic secret is supposed to be the answer—might have been raised. But since the Messiahship of Jesus is fairly certainly affirmed in Q and must have been established in the tradition before Mark handled it, Mark most assuredly was never aware of this question and never bothered to answer it. If the Messianic secret is Mark's theory it cannot be the solution of the problem imagined by Bultmann. Some other explanation must be found for this essay in interpretation by the evangelist. But surely it is much simpler to accept the injunctions to silence as a historic feature of Christ's ministry. It is at least as easy to suggest good reasons why Jesus should have striven to keep the Messianic claim secret as to advance reasons to account for Mark's invention of the Messianic secret. Here, too, I believe Mark is one who hands on, not one who moulds.

I am afraid this is a very negative article. Of course Mark is writing for Gentile Christians and is broadly in sympathy with the Pauline presentation of the Gospel. Bacon's analysis seems to me more worthy of attention and perhaps of acceptance than Bultmann's or Loisy's. But in general this paper is little more than an attempt to justify and underline the word 'and' in the title of Dr. Lightfoot's Bampton Lectures. Loisy and Bultmann seem often to write on the assumption that we must have history *or* interpretation in Mark. I am convinced we have history *and* interpretation, in Mark, and the interpretation has not distorted or obscured the history to the extent which is so readily assumed by the form-critics.

Theology and Seismology.

By the Reverend F. H. Durnford, M.C., M.A., Longhoughton, Alnwick.

On Holy Innocents Day, 28th December 1907, at five o'clock in the morning, occurred in the Straits of Messina one of the greatest calamities—as regards the loss of human life—which the world ever experienced. In a space of not more than forty seconds 200,000 people were crushed to death or buried alive or engulfed by a colossal wave. On 27th December, the day before Holy Innocents, exactly thirty-one years later, again south-eastern Europe has been visited by an earthquake not such a great distance geographically from Messina.

What precisely is the theological significance of earthquakes? In view, for instance, of such a profound and illuminating treatise on 'Creation' which was published in the January number of

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, how should a Christian believer regard an earthquake from the point of view of theology? Seismology is a comparatively modern science. As Professor John Milne, an expert on this subject, has pointed out some thirty years ago—

'Although the terrible effects which often accompany earthquakes have in all ages forced themselves upon the attention of man, the exact investigation of seismic phenomena dates only from the middle of the nineteenth century.'

Three weeks after the earthquake at Messina mentioned above, there was delivered in Canterbury Cathedral a sermon on the event by the late Archbishop Randall Davidson. This sermon has, happily for those who came after, been preserved in a permanent form in the volume known under the title of *Captains and Comrades in the Faith: Sermons Historical and Biographical*. To read it even thirty years after it was delivered is still an inspiration, as indeed it is an inspiration to read the other twenty-five utterances published in the volume referred to. In this sermon the preacher raises the surely important question of what may justly be termed the relation of theology and seismology. He took the first verse of the Bible and asked his hearers to think about that verse in the light of the catastrophe at Messina. Then after some general remarks about the place of the Book of Genesis in religious thought he asked his hearers whether such sentences as 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth' and 'God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good' jarred upon the ear? He then pointed out what a complete change had come over the theological thinking of Christians within the previous one hundred and fifty years, and gave as an instance William Cowper's estimate of the Messina earthquake of 1783—as he wrote it in *The Task*. Here are a few selected lines from the passage referred to.

> Alas for Sicily! rude fragments now
> Lie scatter'd where the shapely column stood.
> Her palaces are dust.
> . . . . . .
> While God performs upon the trembling stage
> Of his own works his dreadful part alone.
> . . . . . Immense
> The tumult and the overthrow, the pangs
> And agonies of human and of brute
> Multitudes, fugitive on ev'ry side,
> . . . . . .
> Tremble and be amaz'd at thine escape,
> Far guiltier England, lest he spare not thee!

Cowper here without hesitation ascribes the calamity to the righteous judgment of God upon human wrongdoing and unbelief. The mystery of the problem does not perplex him. Earthquakes are simply the visitations of an angry deity.

This opinion of Cowper was that shared by nearly all the clerics and religious leaders of the eighteenth century, including John Wesley and Bishop Sherlock alike. Wesley writes in his *Journal* for Thursday, 8th February 1750, a vivid account of the earthquake shock in London which occurred on that day: 'It was about a quarter after twelve that the earthquake began at the skirts of the town. It began in the south-east, went through Southwark, under the river, and then from one end of London to the other. . . . There were three distinct shakes, or wavings to and fro, attended with an hoarse rumbling noise, like thunder. How gently does God deal with this nation! Oh that our repentance may prevent heavier marks of His displeasure!'

John Wesley also composed in the year 1755 *Serious Thoughts on the Earthquake at Lisbon*, a long treatise of some 7000 words. (The eighteenth-century writers were more lavish in their sentences than their successors in the twentieth.)

This treatise is a telling example of Wesley's writing. Tyerman writes of it: 'Perhaps none of Wesley's publications contain so much fiery eloquence as this.' For a vivid description, let it here be said, of the two earthquakes of 1750 and 1756, it would be hard to improve on the descriptions given by Tyerman himself in his monumental and encyclopædic life of Wesley.

It is also worth recording that Charles Wesley also penned in his *Journal* a particularly interesting first-hand account of the earthquake shocks in 1750. His descriptions and observations are reproduced in detail in Jackson's *Life of Charles Wesley*, i. 549–556.

He wrote a sermon entitled 'The Cause and Cure of Earthquakes' which was first published anonymously, probably to find its way into quarters

where the name of Wesley was unwelcome. To the second edition he prefixed his name.

He again considered earthquakes to be examples of the judgments of God, citing those which occurred in Sicily and Jamaica in 1692, and Lima and Callao in 1746. Charles Wesley also published a volume of hymns in two parts, entitled *Hymns occasioned by the Earthquake, March 8, 1750*. A subsequent edition was published in 1756 with reference to Lisbon.

All these nineteen hymns are written with the author's peculiar spirit and fervent piety—and again reflect the theological view of earthquakes held by eighteenth-century Christian leaders. Leaving for the moment the theological outlook of these hymns, some of them as poetry alone still repay careful study, especially No. lx. :

> How weak the thoughts, and vain,
> Of self-deluding men ;
> Men who, fixed to earth alone,
> Think their houses shall endure,
> Fondly call their lands their own,
> To their distant heirs secure !

Like Cowper later in the century, the two celebrated evangelists connected earthquakes definitely with the action of God.

But even more notable in connexion with this matter was the *Letter* written by Thomas Sherlock, Bishop of London, 'to the Clergy and People of London and Westminster on the occasion of the late Earthquakes.'

Indeed the whole story of this Letter needs a chapter to itself. There has lately been published a life of Thomas Sherlock (by Edward Carpenter), a truly engrossing and illuminating volume on Christianity as it was in England in the eighteenth century, and the English Church of that period.

The author of this book devotes some eleven pages to the discussion of the Letter. And again we find Bishop Sherlock holds the accepted views of his time. Earthquakes are simply God's visitations to men for their sins. These eleven pages can only be referred to briefly in an article on Theology and Seismology—those interested in the subject will be well advised to read them fully.

The Bishop of London never doubted for a moment that such calamities were the direct warnings of God, so he wrote and published his treatise to the nation. The success of the Letter was undoubted. Ten thousand copies were sold in the first two days and two editions were quickly run through.

After this, 52,000 copies were printed by Virtue & Goadley, Stationers at the Royal Exchange, to subscribers only. Then special editions at 6d. and 3d. were struck off. Three editions were printed in London in 1750 alone, and one in Glasgow. Another edition was brought out in London in 1755.

As Mr. Carpenter writes: 'It might have been expected that a Letter written to meet a temporary situation would have died with the age, but as late as 1800 and again in 1807 the S.P.C.K. printed it in the Society's series of religious tracts.'

The Bishop began by pointing out the relation in which he stood to the spiritual needs of London which was his reason for writing the Letter; and then in the plainest language attacked the immorality and irreligion of the times [the most charitable critics will agree that the age was an age of iniquity]. He made especially a moving appeal to parents. 'Look near home. See the temptations of this sort which surround these cities, and are indeed so many snares to catch your sons and daughters and apprentices. Can you look on, and be unconcerned ? For God's sake and for the sake of your children and your country, take courage to act like parents and masters of families. Reformation must begin in private families. The Law and the magistrate can punish your children when they become wicked ; but it is you—who must make them good, by proper instruction and proper government.' Bishop Sherlock made the quite true indictment that the people of London did not know how to bring up their youth.

The Bishop also published a special form of prayer for use in time of earthquakes: 'in the style of our most excellent Liturgy.' [Those who know a certain prayer 'for Light' in the book by S. Fox, *A Chain of Prayer across the Ages*, will agree Thomas Sherlock was an able composer of prayers.] Here is the beginning of one of them: 'O God who in thy wrath dost cause the hills to melt away and the foundations of the earth to be shaken—Who didst make earthquakes the beginning of sorrows and the

forerunners of final destruction to the chosen people of Israel because through hardness of heart they rejected the holy Gospel and crucified the Lord of Life. Take away from us infidelity, hardness of heart, and contempt of thy Word and commandments.'

Thomas Sherlock's Letter aroused much opposition and ridicule. It is true the clergy at the same time felt it their duty to pour forth sermons of warning in the same strain, and at Sion College on 27th March, at a meeting, decided to send a deputation to the Bishop to thank him for his leadership. Seven years later Sherlock gave the clergy his portrait evidently as a token of thanks.

But men like Horace Walpole (who incidentally in one of his letters to Mann, written on 11th March 1750, gives a most vivid account of the earthquake) ridiculed the Bishop openly. Of the Letter he wrote that he had never read so impudent, so absurd a piece, ' and was surprised that Sherlock should run a race with Secker for the old ladies.' An unknown Quaker also replied to the Letter denouncing Sherlock for his presumption in calling heaven's vengeance on a profligate generation; incidentally arguing that the Bishop had exaggerated the influence and effect of bad books.

Another anonymous writer attacked Sherlock for construing a mere accident of Nature into a judgment from heaven. Natural science, he contended, was rapidly dispelling such arbitrary notions of the Deity.

It is nearly two hundred years since those middle years of the eighteenth century. And since the Wesleys wrote their journals and sermons and hymns, since Bishop Sherlock directed his Diocese in his own plain-spoken way, and since William Cowper finished *The Task* in the summer of 1784, an incalculable change of theological thinking has come over the minds of English Christians and Christian Englishmen—not least those belonging to the Anglican Communion. One cannot imagine, for instance, a more vivid contrast than the theological thought that lies behind Thomas Sherlock's Letter in 1750, and that which inspired the sermon preached in Canterbury Cathedral on 17th January 1909, by Archbishop Davidson. Let any one put the two utterances side by side and he will see how views about the Nature and Being of God has altered in the course of a hundred and sixty years. Can any student of theology doubt which utterance is more near to the mind of Christ? There is indeed permanent value in much of what was said about earthquakes by John and Charles Wesley, Thomas Sherlock, and William Cowper: Cowper's line for instance—

'And brethren in calamity should love'

is a line for all time and every age.

And if the occurrence of an earthquake in one's own country or the fatherland of other members of the human race helps a Christian believer to think more profoundly about God, it is all to the advantage of that Christian believer. In so far as the Wesleys and William Cowper helped their contemporaries to concentrate on religion surely they were entirely right.

But as Archbishop Davidson expressed the thought in the address in Canterbury Cathedral, the ' message ' of the earthquake ' rings out clear—is it not this?—the need and the possibility of some worthier grasp of the right proportion of things.' Surely the student of theology is given in that sentence the key to a more accurate understanding of the relation of seismology to theology. Both sciences, if they are to be accurately pursued, need to be studied like all other sciences under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But they are both distinct, and each in a sense is a ' science in its own right.' The theologian should not trespass on the province of the seismologist; and *vice versa* the seismologist must allow the theologian the right to think his thoughts about earthquakes with reference to the Faithful Creator. The eighteenth-century clergy were surely right in not leaving God out of the picture. The problem consists in how far natural science is in some mysterious way a realm which is a realm in its own right.

Since Bishop Sherlock lived, men like Professor Eddington have written books such as *The Nature of the Physical World*. John Milne, in the article referred to at the beginning of this essay, has a good deal to say about the effects of earthquakes on the human mind. Among other facts he states: ' In 1755 many of the English clergy held the view that Lisbon was destroyed because its inhabitants

were Catholics, while the survivors from that disaster attributed their misfortune to the fact that they had tolerated a few Protestant heretics in their midst. To avoid a recurrence of disaster certain of these were baptized by force.' Is it any wonder Quaker writers answered Thomas Sherlock back?

Many diverse thoughts will suggest themselves to men when they contemplate the catastrophe of an earthquake. One thinks of the astounding way human nature appears at its best—as in the case of the children of the C.M.S. Girls' School in Japan—whose fortitude so greatly impressed the Japanese nation. Or one thinks again of the unselfish conduct of the Turkish convicts only the other day. Indeed Cowper's line, 'And brethren in calamity should love,' is true in every age. But such thoughts go beyond the purpose of this essay.

All the writer desires to do is to try and point out that the grim fact of an earthquake by no means need weaken faith in a 'Faithful Creator.' On the contrary, seismology, when trustfully studied, should only make a man love theology more.

Natural Science in any of its branches leads not away from, but towards, the God of Jesus Christ, who said there always would be earthquakes in the world. Bishop Berkeley, the eighteenth-century pioneer before his time, once described how he watched a fly crawling up a single pillar in St. Paul's Cathedral. He pointed out that to the insect the stones on the uneven surface would be like so many deformed rocks and precipices. He then went on to compare the point of view of the insect with that of a human being gazing at the symmetry and proportion of the whole building. Is not the message this?—'The need and the possibility of some worthier grasp of the right proportion of things.'

Even earthquakes must be viewed in their right perspective when man thinks about God. For it was God who first conceived the idea of a creation in which for His mysterious purposes earthquakes are permitted. It may prove that in another stage of existence, when mortals are allowed to know what is hid from their understanding now, that earthquakes fulfil the purposes of the Creator in ways beyond our wildest dreams of joy. 'Eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, neither hath it entered the heart of man the things *that God has prepared*.'

To interpret accurately the first verse of the Bible is to place the emphasis on the word 'God.' More important than the fact that the heaven and the earth were created is the fact that God caused them to exist at all.

Just because man has no responsibility whatever for the occurrence of an earthquake—just because seismology is a branch of the study of Natural Science—all the more should the contemplation of an earthquake strengthen faith in God. Earthquakes serve the purposes of the Creator.

Bishop Berkeley's fly crawling up the pillar is a true parable. There is the likeness of every human being as he faces his journey. The sorrow and catastrophe—whether on a big scale in a nation or smaller scale in a personal life—which seems so steep a precipice may be just a curve which, when climbed over, leads onward to a new and more wonderful world.

One fact to a Christian believer is unalterably true for all time. When (as at Messina) in less than a minute 200,000 of God's children changed their mode and place of existence that was not the end of life for them. Rather they entered into a new and more happy realm ruled over by the Faithful Creator we call God. If we reject Cowper's theology in *The Task*, we thankfully accept it in his best-known hymn:

God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform;
He plants His footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm.

Blind unbelief is sure to err,
And scan His work in vain;
God is His own interpreter
And He will make it plain.

'What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter.'

The foregoing article is obviously merely an introduction to a profound and complex theological problem, and opens up many further points for discussion. Perhaps the most helpful and inspiring thoughts of recent days on the subject are to be found in Professor Oliver Quick's *Doctrines of the*

Creed. On pp. 198 and 199 of that truly illuminating theological volume the author writes sentences such as these: 'An earthquake or a flood spreads death and misery among a whole population. It is mere confusion of thought to suppose that when a great many cases of terrible pain occur together at one time and place, the actual amount of pain caused is really greater than in the same number of cases occurring singly and at intervals.

'The problem of pain is really no more and no less perplexing in a Japanese earthquake or a Chines flood than in all the other untimely and distressing deaths which have occurred severally since the world began.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Tracking.

By the Reverend Edward Bragg, Georgetown, St. Vincent, B.W.I.

'Christ . . . leaving us an example, that ye should follow in his steps.'—1 P 2^{21}.

Lord Baden Powell has told us that tracking is called by different names in different countries. In South Africa, for example, following up tracks is called 'spooring,' in India it is called 'pugging,' and it is often referred to in America as 'trailing.'

The more you practise tracking, the more exciting you will find it to be. Naturally it requires very careful observation; one's eyes must always be open. A good tracker can tell by looking at the tracks of a horse whether the horse had been walking, running, or whether it had been lame. The highwaymen of old had a number of tricks by which they tried to deceive any who went in track of them. One of the tricks was to put the shoes of the horses on wrong way round, so that it would appear that the horse had gone in one direction when all the time it had gone in the opposite direction.

Thieves and other modern highwaymen have tricks too, in order to put searchers off their tracks. One trick is to walk backwards. But it is clear, isn't it, that the only persons who would do this are those who have done something that they do not wish to be known. Sometimes houses are broken into, and then, when the police go they cannot find just how or where the thieves broke in. Those thieves have very carefully covered their tracks. So in our language we have this phrase, 'to cover one's tracks,' which means 'to conceal one's acts.'

There are two kinds of acts, the good and the bad. As a rule, it is only the bad kind that people want to hide and cover up. It is because they know they have done wrong and do not want to be found out.

In the Book of Joshua we read about a man called Achan. Joshua had received instructions that in the taking of Jericho they were not to take anything else. Usually when cities were captured in the olden days the victors used to take everything they could lay hands on. But Joshua had been told that there must be no plundering, and Achan knew what had been commanded, but he disobeyed. He stole from the city a beautiful garment, some silver and gold. His conscience told him that he had done wrong, so he had to cover his tracks as best he could. Here were these things, and if he were not to be found out what must he do with them? So his mind was in a perfect muddle as it always is when you do wrong and try to cover it up. In the end he decided to hide these things. He went to his tent, dug a hole, put the stolen articles in the earth, and covered them over, and thought he had been successful. But he was not. He was found out. 'Be sure your sin will find you out,' says the Bible, and it is quite true.

Many boys and girls try to conceal their wrongdoing by telling lies. And there are some people in the world who have so trained themselves in telling lies that you can hardly believe a word they say. Nobody trusts them any more.

Of course, we can all live in such a way that what we do will not require covering up. There is only one way to live so that we shall have nothing of which to be ashamed. And that is to do some tracking ourselves.

Jesus our great Leader has passed this way before us. And 'He has left us an example that we should follow in His steps.' His example is not

only for older people. It is for every boy and girl no matter how young.

Sometimes, I expect, we do not see why we should go to Church or Sunday school. But Jesus loved the Temple and its services; and I do not think they sang children's hymns and had children's addresses as we do now. But He loved it in spite of that. What an example He has left us here! When He was only twelve years of age he was so interested in the Temple that He quite forgot He had to journey back home with His parents. And then, when His father and mother found Him, after much searching, they scolded Him, but He said: 'Oh, Mother, didn't you guess where I should be? I must be interested in the things of my heavenly Father. You do understand, don't you?'

Sometimes, I have no doubt, we feel too tired to say our prayers, or we wonder why we should say them. But Jesus was always having talks with His heavenly Father. And in so many other ways He has left us an example that we should follow in His steps.

So the next time we sing that hymn: 'O Jesus I have promised' and come to the lines

O let me see Thy footmarks,
And in them plant mine own

let us remember that we are to do some tracking, and resolve to follow Jesus as long as we live. You see, there was nothing in His life of which He had to be ashamed. No tracks He had to conceal. And if we walk in His footsteps, neither shall we.

'I Know a Lot.'

By the Reverend Sidney H. Price, Great Shelford, Cambridge.

'Filled with all knowledge.'—Ro 15^{14}.

The other day I glanced over some children's school-books. I wanted to see if their writing was improving.

I noticed that the teacher had set a number of words beginning with 'kn,' knee, knife, know, and the children had to make up sentences using these words.

One of these sentences caught my attention, and I have been thinking a good deal about it since. It was, 'I know a lot.' I looked at it again to make sure I had read it correctly, and sure enough, that was what a small boy of eight had written.

He had used the word rightly, of course, but one day I hope he will learn that it is not usual to boast about our knowledge. As a matter of fact, I think he was just repeating what his teacher had said, for he does know quite a lot for his age.

Sooner or later we all discover that, however much we know, there is still a lot more to learn. We can never hope to learn everything.

Still, I like the spirit of that boy who wrote, 'I know a lot.' It is good to know a lot. Life is so much more interesting if you know a lot.

Have you ever walked through the lanes and fields with people who know a lot about birds and flowers and trees? How interesting the countryside becomes when you have somebody to explain things to you. Some people know a lot about buildings, and I always enjoy a tour of our colleges in Cambridge if there is some one who can tell me about them. In fact, I like to listen to anybody who really knows a lot about anything.

The ancient Greeks had a thirst for knowledge. If there was anything new, they wanted to know all about it. Some of them heard of Jesus. They heard about His teaching. He spoke differently from other people. He did not just repeat what others had said, but said things in a new way. They heard about His miracles, and they wanted to know more about Him for themselves. They came to the disciples one day and said, 'Sir, we would see Jesus.' You see, they wanted to know Him.

You want to know Jesus too, that is one reason why you come to Church and Sunday School. As you get to know a lot about Jesus, you feel that other people ought to know Him too, so you help to send missionaries to other countries. We want the children in other lands to know that God loves them. I wonder if they ever sing a hymn we sometimes use:

I know who makes the daisies,
And paints them starry bright;
I know who clothes the lilies,
So sweet and soft and white;
And surely needful raiment
He will for me provide,
Who know Him as my Father,
And in His love confide.

I know who feeds the sparrow,
And robin red and gay;
I know who makes the skylark
Soar up to greet the day;
And me much more He cares for,
And feeds with daily bread,
Whom He has taught to love Him,
And trust what He has said.

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday after Easter.

The Day of Visitation.

'They are vanity, and the work of errors: in the time of their visitation they shall perish.'—Jer 10^{15}.

'And they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation.'—Lk 19^{44}.

'Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles: that, whereas they speak against you as evildoers, they may by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.'—1 P 2^{12}.

For a time people thought and talked of a 'Recall to Religion': plans were laid, and meetings held, and prayer offered, and the hearts of devout people were no doubt warmed. But is there any deeper movement observable? Are men anywhere in the mood, in view of our actual conditions, to sing: 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited and redeemed his people'?

It is unfortunate that in English the phrase 'the visitation of God' has acquired an uncomfortable and even sinister suggestion. But neither in the Old Testament nor in the New has the word any such gloomy association. As Cruden explains, 'it means a coming for a special purpose, either to bless or to punish.' The prophet Ezekiel describes the process of this visitation in one aspect: 'Behold I will seek out my sheep . . . I will seek that which was lost.' That is the authentic visitation of God.

In each of the three phrases taken from Jeremiah, from Jesus, and from Peter, an indication is given of what God does for men whom He comes to visit.

1. The hint which Jeremiah gives is that when God visits He at least *sees things as they are*. Our human seeing is always hindered by the haze of our likes and dislikes, our hopes and fears. In this tenth chapter we may observe how scornfully the prophet describes the process of manufacturing a god—silver is brought from Tarshish and beaten into plates, gold comes from Uphaz into the hands of the goldsmith, purple and blue are required for the drapery; but everything is the work of skilled craftsmen. Piece by piece the idol is built up by human hands, it is a manufactured article. But no one need suppose that the worshippers thus see their God: imagination plays its part in them, and fear of the unknown, and the power of ancient custom. Renan compares the worship of the Church of Rome, in which he was brought up, to a curtain of gorgeous brocade and cloth of gold—sumptuous and artistic and imaginative in its appeal; but it is stretched across the black emptiness. If any hand were bold enough to pull the screen aside, the world would know that there is nothing behind; but for the multitude the splendid illusion suffices, and its credit remains unchallenged. The same assertion might be made of the pomp and parade of other churches, with their flourish of statistics which on paper look so well; but what lies at the back of them? What of substance is actually achieved?

Ay, and what if God should visit? asks the prophet: He will not be duped by the most elaborate of human devices, for His eyes are as a flame of fire.

But we must not think of God's visitation as altogether merciless and exposing, for it also brings to light, as Jesus tells us, a wealth of hidden virtue and unsuspected beauty. People who have always thought humbly of themselves and whose neighbours have taken them at the same valuation will then be seen shining like stars. Kind deeds, says Jesus, which you did instinctively and thought nothing of, will then be remembered; for in His visitation God sees all things and all people as they are, and the stumbling, oft-discouraged man will then be acknowledged as God's friend.

2. When Jesus Himself spoke of this visitation He thought of God as coming not merely to see things as they are, but to *make them different*. Jerusalem's day of visitation arrived when God, with His help and wonder had appeared—'God manifest in the flesh'; and to the same end He comes to us to-day.

In that age, as in our own, religion had grown largely formal, and though devout people prayed earnestly, the majority treated worship mainly as a matter of outward performance. The heart of man is great and spacious, needing big things to fill it, yet when God was offering them the greatest of all they were content to engage themselves with ritual.

The things offered were immeasurably great: in Luke's Gospel one lovely phrase is used to describe them—'the dayspring from on high,' a kind of heavenly dawn ready to break in upon the greyness of their bleak existence. To Paul it seemed so amazing that he could find nothing to compare it with short of the birth of light in the world: 'God, who said: Let light shine out of darkness, has now shined into my heart.' Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, after speaking of the bewildering silences of God, makes this grand addition: 'He has not always been silent to me. . . . I have felt the power of His love, that God is love

and that He loves me . . . yes, God has broken silence to me.'

But the mystery and the misery of human life is that to so many He makes approach in vain. To us it is given as a promise that 'whosoever knocketh to him it shall be opened'; but no such promise is given to the Lord and Lover of men, who continually is denied admittance. About many of us He has still to report: 'I was a stranger, and ye took me not in,' and on our side it is true that in a world visited and pervaded by the God of all fullness we remain obstinately poor.

3. When Peter speaks of the visitation of God he is thinking of a *change of mood* which it may work even in the unlikeliest of men. It was his lot to live when the tiny Christian communities were lost in a shoreless ocean of paganism. By word and by life the friends of Jesus did their best to commend their Master to a hostile world, but years ran away and there was little to show for all their effort. The cynical minister of a degraded Edinburgh parish once said that certainly one could make an impression on it, just as he might on a bowl of treacle so long as he kept his thumb in it; but withdraw the thumb, and the dimple disappears. That was the judgment of a shrewd and witty man, but does it cover all the facts? Peter, at least, was convinced that in many of these disdainful pagans to whom he had appealed there were unconfessed secrets of disquiet, which some day might transform the whole situation.

This discovery of latent possibilities in our human nature is not confined to religion: a miner of no particular credit will send his married companion up the shaft first for the sake of his wife and bairns, whilst he remains himself to die: a stewardess rushes back into the blazing cabin to drag through smoke and flame a stranger girl committed to her charge. It is magnificent, but we must not therefore think that these are of wholly different stuff from their fellows; for possibilities of the same kind exist in utterly commonplace men and women about us, who pass through life without ever once disclosing what is in them. Only it is there, and on some fit occasion it may break through in splendour. That, certainly, was Peter's thought of the visitation of God. Grant that we Christians make little way, that our efforts are constantly baffled; yet under the surface in these stubborn neighbours of ours the forces of God may be working, and some day their mood will change and our witness find a welcome. And they will glorify God in the day of their visitation.

This is what in our churches we should eagerly desire, a quickened sense in the hearers of the meaning of what has long been familiar. What makes the difference in a congregation between the eager and the slack is not their degree of knowledge but of discernment. The German poet Nietzsche exclaims with rapture in one place: 'Awake and listen, ye lonely ones, for good tidings are coming *to fine ears!*' [1]

Fourth Sunday after Easter.

God and Reality.

'Full of grace and truth.'—Jn 1[14].

Dr. Moffatt translates the word Truth in the lines, 'Full of grace and truth,' 'Shall worship in spirit and in truth,' rendering it Reality: 'Full of grace and reality,' 'Shall worship in spirit and reality.'

Reality is a very solid word, firm to the feet. It is a confident word. There is no nervous look in its eye as it scans the 'stop press' news lest the latest thing has exploded its positions or reduced the value of its stock. Reality is never in peril. It is not to be criticised, appraised, weighed, and argued about; it is there to judge and appraise; all we may give is consent and obedience.

Only a fool attempts to trifle with reality, and the pages of history are full of the story of such folly. One may scheme and plan, play with tinsel and false lights, handle things and contrive with a time-serving spirit, the spirit of jobbery, then suddenly reality stirs, and it is like the sweep of a hand across a chess-board, and pawns, kings, knights, bishops, and castles are swept into an ignominious heap. The blow of reality is sharp enough at times to cut off the head of a king, as in the French Revolution, or powerful enough to crack and split Christendom in two, as at the Reformation.

We are sobered by reality. In the presence of physical forces so powerful that we are impressed by their reality, men work vigilantly and humbly. It may be a huge circular-saw, a crane raising tons of stone and swinging it to place, a liner moving to its berth in dock, an Alpine climber cutting his way beneath the pending avalanche, a captain in the heart of a typhoon—amid such realities men, however familiar with the work, never relax their care. One moment of inattention and an arm is ripped to ribbons; a jerk and incalculable damage is wrought; a point of the compass to right or left and a dock-side is sliced away like cake, or a gash is made in

[1] W. M. Macgregor, in *The Professor as Preacher*, 163.

the side of a liner as though it were matchwood; a shout and half a mountain seems displaced. There is no levity when we are dealing with reality.

So we move from the suburbs of our theme to the one great Reality—God. To grow thoroughly aware of this ultimate reality of our being it may be helpful to use imagery that to some will seem crude and primitive, but which is needed in these days. Let us think of God as a massive objectivity standing over against us and without us, as objective as a tree in a field or as a mountain.

This objectifying of God is necessary to genuine, devout life, to true adoration, penitence, and prayer. We have used the vocabulary of nearness in our thoughts of God, to the exclusion of transcendence, and the fact is these ideas of immanence have proved ineffective. Men did once lose God in the clouds; we have lost Him in our feelings. God is not powerfully real to us until we see Him as the Other.

Our religion has become amorphous, changing with our moods, dependent upon our feelings, and partaking of the caprice of our frail natures. We have thought that because our theologies have changed, our forms of worship and indeed our ethics, the reality of God has shifted with these shadows, and we have forgotten the core of reality, abiding and sure, there, without us, for our finding, in the presence of which the everlasting hills are as unstable as the waves of the sea, and the spinning of the worlds as momentary as the spin of a top, and all our earthly permanence as the leaves of autumn. So our religion has remained religiosity, and diffuse and confused feeling has taken the place of conviction, humble obedience, and spiritual energy.

Reality is a fearful thought. But there is comfort in it. For what abides may be trusted, what remains the same yesterday and to-day and for ever may be depended upon.

Howbeit this sense of transcendence is not enough. The next step must be the Incarnation. Only by this thought of the 'Otherness' of God do we see the necessary and beautiful meaning of the Incarnation. If He is so Other to ourselves, then we need one to bring Him near—one who speaks our language but without our stammer, who lives our life but without our sin. For though God is afar off, we have a thirst for Him like the thirst of the hart, and a hunger as the hunger of the sea.

In our complex nature we know not what is akin and what is alien to God. Of old in the Dionysian dance men felt themselves united to God through their most primitive instincts and feelings. The 'will-to-power' philosophers tell us that in the dominating instincts we are akin to God. We want a guide to ourselves.

We seem to need what orthodoxy tells us Christ is. For if He is only another peering into the darkness, a guesser amid the shadows reaching up to and dreaming of God, then we have no fullness of assured knowledge of God, and the world is just where it was after all the dreaming and thinking and prophesying before Christ came, dissatisfied and plagued with half-lights and intolerable shadow.

But if Christ is real as God is real, then His beatitudes become not pretty sayings, but the unfolding of eternal realities; His mission is not a display of the higher conscience of the race, but the satisfying answer to that conscience, and His death is not only a martyrdom or an example, but an energy and redeeming purpose of God that we need, for when God draws near, He is judgment for our souls and flame to our sins.

That leads to another thought. If our religion is reality, then all our dealings with it must be real. Reality demands and indeed evokes reality. Real danger means that you must put aside bravadoes and approach it with real courage. Real burdens call for real endurance, real sorrow brushes aside sentimentalism, and requires real sympathy and true easement. So we are called to be real before God in worship and prayer. But when men are real, turning from every vanity and insincerity, what is the thought that overwhelms them? It is that they are sinners, that they have betrayed something, defied something, missed their way. So we read, 'Full of grace and reality,' which might be read 'Full of grace which is reality.' For the Christian revelation is that the ultimate reality is gracious, that the final expression on the face of God is not judgment and a frown, not authority or retribution, but a smile. His mercy is over all His works.[1]

Fifth Sunday after Easter.

The Service of Our Neighbour.

'Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.'—Ja 1^{27}.

Of all the apostolic writers St. James is the most severely practical. Perhaps that is why the Church reads so much of him in Eastertide, when all the Gospels are taken from St. John, the prince of mystics; perhaps it is to remind us that a purely

[1] A. E. Whitham, *The Discipline and Culture of the Spiritual Life*, 34.

mystical religion which does not affect the conduct of our lives may be an admirable religion, but is not Christianity. At any rate we have the fact that we are given this severely practical saint to read in several Sunday Epistles, and we are given his festival on the first of May.

He is rather an awkward writer. Martin Luther regarded his letter as 'a right strawy epistle' and wanted to reject it from the Canon. More orthodox churchmen have been quite content to leave it there and ignore it completely. But there it stands, an awkward and angular reminder that religion is entirely worthless if it ceases to be a practical thing that colours the whole conduct of our daily lives.

Naturally we need not press the words of St. James in a purely pedantic way to the letter; visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction is a general description of social service. When he wrote conditions were no doubt more simple. We may take it that his meaning is that pure religion is the service of our neighbour and the keeping of ourselves unspotted from the world. And it is only the former we are considering at present.

The first thing that matters about social service is to ask ourselves why we should feel it our duty to serve our neighbour? Of course, if we happen to like some one, we shall be glad to help him: but that is not the service of our neighbour, the person into whose society God has set us, a person who may be as uncongenial to us as the good Samaritan was bound to be to every pious Israelite. We are called upon to help our neighbour by many people at the present day; but, when we ask why we should, the answer is not so clear. Sometimes there is more than a hint that our neighbour being unemployed and condemned to a squalid existence in a slum on the Tyneside is being exposed to the insidious propaganda of Communism, and that if we don't do something about it the result may be rather disastrous for us. Well, it may be an excellent reason; but we have an uneasy suspicion that St. James would have said rather unkind things about visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction for such a motive as this. 'Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth.' An awkward man, but he is in the calendar of the Church.

Or are we told how attractive it is? That is at any rate a much better reason. There is no doubt that for a time social service can be very interesting and attractive. Moreover it has about it at first an air of romantic adventure. It is only after a few years that we realize how much of it is dull and monotonous. We find that after a year or two our neighbour remains much as he was, and isn't even always grateful for the labour we have spent on him. And so we revert to the comfortable ways of life.

It all comes back to the question, 'Why should I help my neighbour, if I don't find it amusing or pleasant?' For the solid fact is that it is often the reverse. The answer is a very simple one. There is absolutely no reason on earth why we should. But there happens to be a reason in heaven. If our neighbour is, in God's sight, of infinite worth; if he is of such value that his soul, no less than ours, was worth the price that was paid for our redemption on the hill of Calvary, if in serving Christ's little ones we are being privileged to minister to the Lord Himself, there are excellent reasons why we should seek to serve our neighbour. And there are excellent reasons why we should do so without patronizing him, as it is all too easy to do; for if we minister to him, we are ministering to the Lord, and if we patronize him, we are presumably patronizing the Lord.

There can be no genuine service of our neighbour unless we are trying sincerely by our prayers and by the labour of our mind and will to do all that we can to establish justice and righteousness on earth. If all men are created by God to know Him and to love Him, if they all share that nature which He took upon Him; if they were all alike redeemed at the price of His most precious blood, it follows that in the essential matters they are equal, and that differences of intelligence or wealth are only differences about trivial and secondary matters which have no eternal value.

And if that is so, it follows that any order of society, which condemns any of its members to a life in which poverty and oppression make the love of God a task of almost impossible difficulty, is self-condemned. All men are entitled to life; and there is no true life but the life of Him who came that men might have life and have it more abundantly. A civilization, which by its cruelty and injustice blinds men to the love of God, has failed. It is true that no amount of evil makes the love of God impossible; but it makes it for many unduly and intolerably hard, while leaving it easy for others. Our religion will never be pure and undefiled before God the Father, merely because it includes a little mild visiting of the fatherless and widows in their affliction, unless it also makes us clear in our resolve to do all that we can to pull down injustice and oppression in the high places of the earth. We may differ perhaps in our view as to

how it should be done; some may be for more drastic and radical remedies than others. But we must never forget that the Catholic faith is more than a right interpretation of the creeds and a right use and understanding of the sacraments. At the heart of its central mysteries we find the terrible warning: 'Ye cannot serve God and mammon.' [1]

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.

Persistence the Law of Prayer.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'Knock, and it shall be opened unto you.'—Lk 11^{9}.

The central figure in this parable is the intermediate friend, the man who was friend to both the other two characters in the story. Let us look at the three in turn.

First, there is the friend on a journey. What was his destination? Whence had he come? Why did he arrive so late? Was he delayed in starting? Did he take a wrong road? Many questions we may ask, but there is no sure answer. All we know is that he arrived at his friend's house near midnight with a need for food which his friend could not satisfy. 'I have nothing to set before him,' is the latter's pathetic confession. Have we not here a suggestion of the many and varied needs that send men to prayer? Parents aware of their children's need of spiritual nurture, teachers thinking of their pupils, ministers thinking of their people, all may well echo these words. Indeed, they often have done so. Dr. John R. Mott writes: 'It is one thing to have water enough to quench our own thirst. It is quite another thing to be able to supply the multitude. Those of us who are called upon to help so many other people will have to go to the fountain more frequently than if we have only our personal needs to consider.' Many desperate needs have driven men to prayer in the sad realization that of themselves they have nothing to set before their friends. This vaguely outlined but certainly needy figure stumbling into his friend's house in the darkness may well symbolize the varied incentives to prayer that arise out of the innumerable needs and claims of those whose pathway of life crosses ours.

Second, there is the friend in the house with his adequate supplies. He is a more definite figure. He does not deny that he has ample provision for his own household and for others; and he is not mean, for in the end he gives his friend loaves 'as many as he needeth.' His tardy response is simply due to a disinclination to be disturbed. How natural and yet how flimsy is his excuse about disturbing the children, as if his friend's hammering on the door without and his own shouting from within must not already have disturbed the children! How true to life it is! Yes, but is it true to God? Jesus does not say that is what God is like; but He does say that that is what God seems to be like to the man who prays and prays and for a long time gets no answer. Have we not known that disappointment and the doubt that follows? Does God hear? Is He not too much occupied with greater concerns to take thought for ours? Does He really care?

Third, there is the intermediate friend. He is the link between the friend on a journey with his need of food and the friend in the house with his ample supplies. He is a kind-hearted man. He will not delay till the morning. The appeal of need stirs him to immediate action. Moreover, he is a confident man. Perhaps he had been visiting that evening and had observed how much bread his neighbour had in store, so that when the emergency arose he knew where to turn. Best of all, he is a persistent man, actually shameless in his persistence, and thus he gains his end.

Truly, that kind of persistence gets things done in the world of men, and also, Jesus would have us believe, in the world of prayer. Why it should be so, why God should sometimes require such persistence is another question. It is possible to suggest some answers, though mystery in part remains: but the point for us to lay hold upon is that, mystery or not, this counsel of persistence in prayer comes out of our Lord's own experience. Some glimpses of His persistent knocking we catch in the Gospels. At the beginning of His ministry, confronted by the question as to what kind of approach to men was consistent with His vocation, He knocks and knocks for forty days, seeking light. Did He not pray, seemingly with little result, for the Jewish people and for their leaders that they might see the things that belonged to their peace? And did He not pray for the disciples, for Peter and for Judas, with a persistence that was not soon rewarded and yet was not quenched? Assuredly He speaks here in the tones of realism. He will not hide the facts. He knows that to the man who prays God sometimes seems like a reluctant neighbour, well-disposed perhaps and fully supplied but too comfortable to bestir himself. Is it not also realism when He speaks again out of His own experience: 'Ask, and it

[1] W. L. Knox, in *Sermons for the Year 1932*, p. 169.

shall be given you ; seek, and ye shall find ; knock, and it shall be opened unto you ' ?

It has been objected to prayer in the form of petition for personal blessings or in the form of intercessions for others that such prayer indicates lack of real trust in God. Surely, it is said, an All-Wise and All-Loving God does not need such begging and reminding. That may seem an objection inspired by profound Christian faith, but it finds little support in the Gospels. Our Lord's own prayers contain definite petitions and intercessions, and His encouragements to His disciples to pray with definiteness of request are impossible to gloss over. Most of us have no difficulty in following Him in this particular ; but we do find it hard to follow His bidding when He urges that, ever seeking to make our requests more truly in His name with all that implies, we must persist even when it seems as if God were heedless or unwilling to grant them.

How readily our prayers of intercession faint and fail, even prayers which we can make with confidence because we are so sure of the Divine will as regards such matters. There was that man who came our way ten years ago and opened his heart to us. We saw his need and in a fumbling way we tried to help him, but we saw, too, that in the last resort we had nothing to set before him. We pointed him to God and then we prayed. For weeks and months we prayed earnestly, and then he passed out of our circle or perhaps he hardened his heart in the old ways, and our prayers, unanswered, finally ceased. Again, it may be as regards wider concerns that we most need in these days to hear this strong encouragement to persistent prayer. What prayers has the Church offered these last twenty years for world peace, and still it tarries ! What prayers with strong crying and tears have we not offered in recent months ! Are our intercessions now enfeebled by a doubt ? Surely we need to catch again the confidence of our Lord's realism as He assures us, in the light of all He knows of delays and disappointments and of times and seasons that the Father keeps in His own hand, that we must persist, even as it may seem to the point of shamelessness. ' Knock, and it shall be opened unto you.'

Remember, too, that He who gives us this counsel of persistence in definite prayer is the Great Intermediate Friend, the ' one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.' As Ascensiontide reminds us there is one, ' who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.' That means that we never pray alone. Even at our bedside we pray always as members of Christ's Body, united in Him with all our brethren. ' There is really one prayer to God,' says a writer, ' and that is the one prayer of the one Son to the Father : our prayer is only real inasmuch as it is taken into that prayer.' Boldly then and persistently we may come to the throne of grace in the name of Him to whom the many and varied needs of His earthly friends are ever present as He, in the heavenly sanctuary, ' ever liveth to make intercession for them.'

WHITSUNDAY.

The Fellowship of the Holy Ghost.

BY THE REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, B.D., M.A., LLANDAFF, CARDIFF.

' The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.'—2 Co 13^{14}.

If these words have become so familiar that they have ceased to stir our hearts, let us try to think of what they meant to those who heard them for the first time. For them that phrase, ' the communion of the Holy Ghost,' would be a very striking one. *Communion* for us is a religious word, associated with Church and Sacraments, and the whole sentence makes us feel as though we were in Church. But for the Greek-speaking Corinthians it was quite different. For them, as for us, the word *communion* was connected with the word *common*, though the religious associations of *communion* make us forget this. But for the Corinthians it was not a religious word at all but had secular and even commercial associations, meaning partnership, society, community of interests, and the like ; and the adjective from which it came was, like our own *common*, frequently used in a bad sense which coupled it with *unclean*. The ideas connected with it were the very opposite of anything that might suggest *holy* or *spiritual*. That which was *common* could not be *holy*, could not pertain to God. We can now guess what a new and startling idea the communion of the Holy Ghost must have been to the Corinthians, and even to us the idea may be new and startling though the words are familiar.

We too find it hard to bring what is holy and what is common into connection with each other. What pertains to God is to our minds remote from what is common to us. At Ascensiontide we sing of how Christ has raised our human nature to the right hand of God. That is a great thought. But the

largeness of it sometimes escapes us, for we think of the right hand of God as operating beyond our ken altogether, somewhere in heaven out of our sight. That is wrong. Think of what the right hand of God really means. In the Psalms we sing of how the right hand of the Lord bringeth mighty things to pass. Where and when are these mighty things brought to pass? In heaven? Or in the remote past? Or in the distant future? Yes, but when we think of the right hand of God bringing mighty things to pass in the creation of the world, the stars, the sun, the sky, working mightily in the life, death, and Resurrection of Christ, in His Ascension, in the gift of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, and about to do still greater things in the years to come, let us remember that the right hand of God is all potent in the present, bringing mighty things to pass here and now, in the lives of our neighbours and of ourselves.

How can this be? By the communion of the Holy Ghost. If we think on this we shall understand more of God's ways of working; we shall be able to put more meaning into our thanksgiving for Pentecost, into our petitions for the direction and guidance of the Holy Spirit, and we shall be able to put more purpose into our strivings to produce the fruits of the Spirit in our lives.

Let St. Paul himself interpret this wonderful phrase of his, the communion of the Holy Ghost. In another letter to these same Corinthian converts he says that he is speaking wisdom among the initiated, a wisdom not of this world, but foreordained before the worlds unto our glory. It is a large claim that he makes, yet not a boastful one, for he tells us how he came by this wisdom. It was not by his own cleverness, nor was it the reward of a long and exact training in philosophy. This wisdom had been revealed to him by the Spirit that searcheth the deep things of God. Then he goes on to explain his meaning by an analogy. Just as it is the spirit of a man that knows the things of a man, that is, his interests, his thoughts, his plans, so 'the things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God.' It is through the Spirit of God that we are enabled to see the extent of our inheritance.

You see what he is leading up to, that the communion or fellowship of the Holy Ghost means being initiated into the purposes of God, so that we may become God's fellow-workers. Without this sharing of God's plans we could be no more than His slaves. But being God's fellow-workers means being taken into God's confidence, being the friends of God; it means having the mind of Christ Himself, living the supernatural life.

And do not be mistaken about this. Living the supernatural life is not an affair of signs and wonders that all can see and marvel at even if they cannot understand. St. Paul warns us that the things of the Spirit are foolishness to the natural man. He cannot understand them. He will not think us wonderful people at all, but will only pity us for being such fools. And we have not far to look for the natural man. We find him in ourselves and in our neighbours. He is always telling us that human nature is human nature, and that if we make any fight against our passions, against our nature, it is bound to be a losing one.

From his own point of view the natural man is quite right, but that is no longer our point of view, for we are risen with Christ, seeking the things that are above, where Christ is seated at the right hand of God, and so our standards are set, not by the imperfect examples of human nature that we see around us, but the One who was more truly man than any man that ever lived. From the very beginning of His ministry He would not trust Himself to the crowds that followed Him, for He knew what was in man. His is the example for us to follow. We must not trust ourselves to the world nor be conformed to its ways, for we belong to a different society, the fellowship of the Holy Ghost.

This communion of the Holy Ghost is part of our heritage into which many of us have not yet entered. When St. Paul was at Ephesus he met some disciples and asked them if they had received the Holy Ghost when they believed. They were taken aback and replied as though the Holy Ghost meant little or nothing to them. St. Paul then asked about their baptism, and they told him that they had received the baptism of John. But John the Baptist had lived before Pentecost.[1]

Many earnest and sincere people to-day are like these Ephesian Christians. They would be taken aback by a question like St. Paul's. The Baptist's baptism was one of repentance, preparatory for baptism with the Holy Ghost. So there are people to-day whose lives are marked by moral earnestness, by a real desire to do good, but who seem to have little conscious contact with the living God. It has been well said that expectation limits experience, and that the possession of the wisdom and power of God is bounded by our lack of any anticipation of receiving them, or rather by our failure to appreciate that they are ours already.

John the Baptist said of our Lord, 'He must

[1] Ac 19. Cf. H. S. Coffin, *In a Day of Social Rebuilding*, 107.

increase, and I must decrease.' And that should be the aspiration of all of us, to be more and more possessed by the Holy Ghost, to realize more and more our fellowship with him, and through him with one another, to have more and more of the mind of Christ. That does not mean that we become less ourselves; it does not mean the obliteration in our characters of those things for which our friends love us. But it does mean that we are becoming more like what God intended us to be, enriched with the gifts of the Spirit, and producing in our lives the fruits of the Spirit, which are these: love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control.

We know what the natural man—that is, newspapers, novels, the cinema, the conversationalist in the railway compartment—we know what he means when he reminds us of our infirmity, but we need not be surprised if he looks blankly at us when we speak of the Spirit that helpeth our infirmities, himself making intercession for us, and yet, if we really live in the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, even the natural man may begin to see something.

Tribulation, anguish, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, and sword—the world is serving a terrible apprenticeship of such things. But it is we who, by the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, do not indeed escape all this, but know the love of Christ through whom we are more than conquerors (literally, *super-conquerors*) in all these things.

The Plan of the First Epistle of John.

By the Reverend C. Clare Oke, M.A., Sundridge, Ontario.

In his masterly exposition of the First Epistle of John, *The Tests of Life*, the late Professor Law asserted that to his mind the letter was 'an apparatus of tests'; that its definite object was 'to furnish its readers with an adequate set of criteria by which they might satisfy themselves of their being "begotten of God."' The writer himself said in 5^{13}, 'I have written these things to you that you may know that you have eternal life.' 'And throughout the Epistle,' according to Dr. Law, 'these tests are definitely, inevitably, and inseparably—doing righteousness; loving one another; and believing that Jesus is the Christ, come in the flesh, sent by the Father to be the Saviour of the world.' And he claimed not only that those were the main ideas in the book but also that they supplied in that order a clue to its structure hitherto untraced. 'After the prologue,' he writes, 'the Epistle consists of a threefold repetition and application of these three fundamental tests of the Christian life.'

His claim to have discovered the key to the design of the Epistle and therefore largely to its understanding has been disallowed by every scholar acquainted with his book that I have been able to consult. For example, A. L. Humphries, presumably responsible for listing Law's work in the bibliography in *Peake's Commentary*, writes, 'I John is difficult of analysis.' B. S. Easton who says in *The Abingdon Bible Commentary* with regard to Law's volume that it is 'brilliantly written,' nevertheless speaks of the Epistle as 'the despair of the formal analyst.' The late Dr. A. T. Robertson in a recent survey of Johannine literature, *Epochs in the Life of the Apostle John*, refers to the contents of *The Tests of Life* and admits that the various topics which Law discusses do occur but, he insists, 'not in that order or in any order.' Weightiest of all, E. F. Scott in giving an outline of the thought of the Epistle in his *Literature of the New Testament* says that John's object was 'to prove the validity of his inward experience' and that he did this by offering three main tests, that of ethical conduct, that of belief, and that of brotherly love. The use of these standards surely implies knowledge of Law's exposition, and yet Scott declares, 'There have been many attempts to reduce the Epistle to an ordered plan, but they all break down.' Law's contention as to the structure of the letter thus seems to have been unconvincing.

When we examine the matter for ourselves, I

think that we find that the trouble cannot lie with the first two headings, Righteousness and Love. According to Dr. Law the Epistle consists mainly of three cycles: 2^{3-28}; 2^{29}–4^{6}; and 4^{7}–5^{21}. The opening paragraph in the first cycle which I think should go back to 2^{1}, 2^{1-6}, which speaks of refraining from sin, of obeying God's commands (αὐτοῦ), of obeying His word, and of walking as Christ walked (ἐκεῖνος), clearly deals with righteousness. The opening paragraph of the second main division, 2^{29}–3^{10a}, referring three times to practising righteousness, to the purification of oneself as Christ is pure, and, to use G. G. Findlay's phrase, to 'the inadmissibility of sin,' also treats very plainly of righteousness. In the third great section of the Epistle the sequence of thought is, as Dr. Law himself points out, somewhat different. There are, he contends, two groups of paragraphs, each dealing successively with love and belief, and then a final short paragraph of which the subject is righteousness. This last brief passage referred to, 5^{18-19}, treating of abstinence and preservation from sin, obviously does come under the head of righteousness. There is a clear allusion also to righteousness in the concluding part of the short composite paragraph 5^{1-4}, in the reference to keeping the commands of God which are not burdensome. And if, as will later be suggested, 2^{13c-17} belongs to this third cycle, there is in the closing verse of that passage, in the mention of performing the will of God, another abundantly evident reference to righteousness.

The second paragraph in the first cycle, 2^{7-11}, alluding to the old and yet new command—'Christ's law of love,' according to Dr. Findlay—and explicitly to loving one's brother, deals quite clearly with love. Dr. Law would include, I think wrongly, 2^{15-17} with this section: it begins with μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε, but its real theme is the incompatibility of worldliness with devotion to God and the transiency of it, curiously admitted by Fitzgerald:

> The Worldly Hope men set their Hearts upon
> Turns Ashes—or it prospers; and anon,
> Like Snow upon the Desert's dusty Face,
> Lighting a little hour or two—is gone.

The second paragraph in the second cycle, $3^{10b-24a}$, which speaks of loving one another and being unlike Cain, of knowing that we have migrated out of the domain of death into that of life because we love our fellow-Christians, of what love is, namely, self-sacrifice and actual generosity, of the assurance resulting from such love even in the face of God's all-seeing judgment, and of a closing command to believe—which is transitional—and to love, treats as well almost exclusively of love. One of the paragraphs in the third chief division, 4^{7-12}, which urges us to love one another because love is of God, because God loved us so deeply that He sent His son as a propitiation for our sins, and because it will enable us to have God, hitherto unseen, within us, should certainly be placed under Love. And the other paragraph put under this heading by Professor Law, 4^{16b-21}, which starts with 'God is love' and goes on to speak of love casting out fear, especially of the last judgment, and of love for God involving love for our fellows, also deals plainly with that subject. Thus any one who reads the Epistle at all carefully can hardly deny the truth of Dr. Law's thesis so far as Righteousness and Love are concerned.

Dissent has come perhaps from his placing of all the remaining passages, with the exception of 2^{12-14}, under the title of Belief. That heading is, in my opinion, correct, but it is not immediately evident. Law would, I am suggesting, have commanded assent if he had headed these passages Belief *through the Spirit* or Possession of the Spirit of Truth. The third paragraph of the first cycle, 2^{18-28}, after an opening, contrasting reference to the antichrists or false teachers, says, '*You* have an anointing from the holy One'—the influence of the Spirit sent by Christ from the Father (cf. Jn 14^{17} 15^{26})—'and you all possess knowledge.' The truth that is learned thereby that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, is next indicated. And then the paragraph concludes with another allusion to the Spirit: 'As for you, the anointing which you received from him (God) remains in you, and you have no need that any one should teach you.' The third paragraph of the second cycle, 3^{24b}–4^{6}, begins, 'Hereby we get to know that He (God) is remaining within us, from the Spirit which He gave us,' and it proceeds to tell how to distinguish the Spirit of

truth from the Spirit of error by its pointing to Jesus Christ as having come in the flesh. The former of the two corresponding paragraphs in the third main section, 4^{13-16a}, opens similarly, 'Hereby we get to know that we are remaining in Him (God) and He in us, because He has given us of His Spirit,' and it goes on to deal briefly with the belief that Jesus is the Saviour of the world and the Son of God. The other passage in the third division, 5^{5-12}, speaks of full belief in Christ, as having come 'not by the water only but by the water and the blood,' as due to the Spirit: 'The Spirit it is that testifies because the Spirit is truth,' and it alludes in the second half to God's testimony and to this testimony as being within oneself. In other words, every one of the passages in the body of the Epistle, other than those which deal with righteousness and love and 2^{12-17}, treats of the possession of the Spirit of truth and the belief in the divinity of Christ which it induces.

Professor Law explained 2^{12-14}, which alone will not fit into this scheme, as parenthetical. But it has occurred to me that that passage, which has no relation to what precedes and with its difficult change of tense from the present, γράφω, to the aorist, ἔγραψα, whether it is the epistolary aorist, equivalent to a present, or not, may be, together with 2^{15-17}, a combination of two displacements. 2^{12-13b}, 'I am writing to you, little children, because your sins have been forgiven you for His Name's sake'—the reference is usually taken to be to Christ, but the parallelism would indicate that it is to God; 'I am writing to you, fathers, because you have come to know Him who is from the beginning; I am writing to you, young men, because you have conquered the evil One,' would come perfectly after the Prologue and Introduction ending at 1^{10}. In that position it would have clear reference back to the fact of God's integrity and willingness to forgive spoken of in 1^{9}, to the Logos which was from the beginning in 1^{1}, and the concluding line with its allusion to our vanquishing of the evil One would prepare for 2^{1} with its expectation that we should live without sinning. The present immediate context with its condemnation of the presumptuous claim, 'We have not sinned,' makes a poor preparation for the expression of that hope or desire. And we should note that the phraseology of 2^{1} is exactly parallel to that of the opening line of the passage we would insert.

The rest of the passage, 2^{13c-17}, 'I have written to you, little ones, because you have come to know the Father'—note that this allusion to God clinches the interpretation of 'His Name' given above and the reference to 1^{9}: 'I have written to you, fathers, because you have come to know Him who is from the beginning; I have written to you, young men, because you are strong and the word of God'—it seems to me that, in spite of 1^{10}, we should perhaps translate the original as in the Apocalypse 19^{13}, 'the Logos of God'—'remains in you and you have conquered the evil One. Stop loving the world, and the things that are in the world; if any one loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the desire of the flesh and the desire of the eyes and the show of life, is not of the Father but is of the world. And the world is passing away, and its desire, but he who performs the will of God remains for ever,' this would go excellently after 5^{21} which at present makes the Epistle end with extreme abruptness. Particularly suggestive of that placing are the following considerations: the occurrence of the aorist ἔγραψα with its usual sense, 'I have written,' in 5^{13}; the reference in 5^{18b} to the preserving power of Christ, which seems to be parallel to the possible allusion to the Logos in 2^{14b}, and to the foiling of the evil One, the mention of whom is, I feel, of considerable significance; the harsh conception of the world in 5^{19}—in its present position there is nothing to prepare for the injunction, 'Stop loving the world': indeed, 2^{2} which contains the only previous reference to the world and which speaks of Christ being the propitiation for it might make the command unintelligible to a reader unacquainted with what Scott has shown to be John's dualistic attitude toward the world; and the allusion in v.[20] to the knowledge of God possessed by Christians. 2^{13c-17} would make a far worthier conclusion for the Epistle than its present ending. Is not 2^{17}, 'The world is passing away, and its desire, but he who performs the will of God remains for ever,' one of the grandest affirmations of all Scripture?

A roll such as our Epistle would be first written on was made by pasting several sheets of papyrus together, by the edges. 'In a papyrus roll,' writes Dr. George Milligan in his interesting volume *Here and There Among the Papyri*, p. 50, 'the opening and closing leaves would naturally be those most handled, and consequently those most likely to be mutilated or broken off.' Streeter makes the same remark in *The Four Gospels*, p. 338, 'The two ends of a roll would always be the most exposed to damage; the beginning ran the greater risk, but, in a book rolled from both ends, the conclusion was not safe.' We have a clear case of the loss of a concluding passage at the end of Mark's Gospel. Would it not have been very easy for this Epistle to have had its last page become detached and for what was meant to be an echo of the author's announcement of his purpose, giving a pleasant sense of revolving completion—recall, for example, what Keats has at the beginning and the end of his *Eve of St. Agnes*—would it not have been easy for that echoing statement of his object to be joined to the opening one, especially if the latter, originally a part of the first segment of the roll which had become worn, was already a separate fragment? The reference in the concluding verse to the world passing away may account for the united whole being placed before 2^{18}, which alludes to the last hour. There is, however, no visible connexion between the context and the opening verse of the passage in question.

If the objection be offered that it is unlikely that John's mind should work according to a plan and according to logical connexions, the answer can be made that his writing in the Gospel, assuming common authorship, shows the same adherence to patterns. The central sections of the Gospel take the following form: first, a Jewish feast is mentioned; then an account is given of a mighty work of Jesus having a clear reference to some feature or ceremony of the festival; and finally there is presented a discourse or declaration also having relation to the feast (see B. W. Bacon, *Jesus and Paul*, 219 f.). And as Dr. Percy Gardner has pointed out, in Jesus' conversations with Nicodemus, with the woman of Samaria, and with the Jews at Capernaum, there can be distinguished the following design: (*a*) the occasion; (*b*) the thesis; (*c*) the misunderstanding; and (*d*) the development (*The Ephesian Gospel*, 112 f.). John's mind did work according to plan.

Entre Nous.

'There being a crowd in the place.'

'We live preoccupied lives, cluttered up, overfull, from which some of the loveliest things are commonly crowded out.

'In Dr. Weymouth's translation of the Gospel according to John occurs this verse: "Jesus had passed out unnoticed, there being a crowd in the place." He was jostled out of their attention by a throng. We commonly picture the rejection of Christ in the dramatic terms of the Cross. They cruelly crucified Him. But to-day we are thinking not about the Cross but about the crowd as the way of rejecting Him. We do not easily imagine ourselves crucifying Christ. At any rate, that language would be figurative. We would not really do it. But crowding Him out is not figurative. That is literal. We do that all the time. Christ and the supreme values He stands for are lost in the traffic. They pass out unnoticed, there being a crowd in the place.

'In one of Arnold Bennett's novels there is a character, a woman of the extreme modern type, who, to the surprise of her friends, began to read Shakespeare and the Bible as a diversion. One day in the forty-sixth Psalm she ran on these words: "Be still, and know that I am God." She did not know what the words meant, but she was strangely impressed. She talked to her friends about it, and they too said that they did not know what the words meant, but they felt a mysterious impressiveness, some magic of the style, perhaps a deep serenity in the idea, as though a voice from another

world spoke to their hectic lives. They got no further with the matter. They never did understand what the words meant, but once in a while they spoke together about them, and wondered why it was that even when they repeated them the words seemed great: "Be still, and know that I am God." Arnold Bennett told the truth about some of us there, and about wide areas of our modern life. The loveliest things—quiet hours of inspiration when the visitations of the Divine have opportunity, the hours when the Over-Soul lays its hand upon the soul—pass out unnoticed in a crowd.' [1]

Relative Distinctions.

'Tyranny is not war. It is peace, but it is a peace which has nothing to do with the peace of the Kingdom of God. It is a peace which results from one will establishing a complete dominion over other wills and reducing them to acquiescence. One of the most terrible consequences of a confused religious absolutism is that it is forced to condone such tyranny as that of Germany in Czecho-Slovakia and Poland. It usually does this by insisting that the tyranny is no worse than that which is practised in the so-called democratic nations. Whatever may be the moral ambiguities of the so-called democratic nations, and however serious may be their failure to conform perfectly to their democratic ideals, it is sheer moral perversity to equate the inconsistencies of a democratic civilization with the brutalities which modern tyrannical States practise. If we cannot make a distinction here, there are no historical distinctions which have any value. All the distinctions upon which the fate of civilization has turned in the history of mankind have been just such relative distinctions. . . .

'At the present moment the secular Press [in America] sees the realities in Europe more clearly, and assesses the issues more justly, than the religious Press, in as far as the latter is confused by absolutist and perfectionist illusions. Could anything be more confusing than a religious absolutism which accuses the Christian churches of belligerent nations of "placing Christ in uniform"; that is, of giving unqualified religious sanction to relative political objectives, while it is itself engaged in the most uncritical identification of Gospel perfectionism with the morally dubious and mixed motives of political neutrality?' [2]

Colonies.

'The political map of the world is the result of "nature," of race, of conquest, of sin in many forms, and only in a small degree of justice. It is idle to ask whether it is just that the British should have held Gibraltar or Malta as abstract questions of strict right. We cannot reconsider all the conquests and annexations of the past; we cannot unravel the twisted skein of history. But we can ask whether the British Empire to-day is unjustly wronging any of its members or those countries that lie outside it, and we can raise the question whether in the interests of justice and a permanent settlement the British Empire should be willing to make some sacrifices beyond those incurred in war. . . .

'The British people has no right to hold any colonies except upon the principle that they be held and administered primarily for the benefit of their inhabitants. This principle has been consciously adopted by the British Government, though its application still leaves much to be desired. But, if colonies are to be held for the benefit not primarily of the holders but of the inhabitants, there is no obvious advantage in holding colonies at all. Even were the British Empire willing, no justice would be served by a handing round of colonies to other powers; but, if the principle of the responsibility of the older civilizations towards the younger were fully accepted, it would be fair that all "colonies" should be administered by an international civil service. Some solution along these lines would be warmly supported by many British Christians and does not seem beyond the bounds of practical politics.' [3]

[1] H. E. Fosdick in *The Christian World*, 11th March.

[2] Reinhold Niebuhr, *Why the Christian Church is not Pacifist*, 25 f.

[3] N. Micklem, *May God Defend the Right*, 149 f.

Antagonism to Science?

Dr. T. Howard Somervell, L.M.S. missionary at Neyyoor, Travancore, writes in his new book, *Knife and Life in India*: 'the material kind of science, when divorced from God or from spiritual values, has led the world to the brink of self-annihilation, and has evolved the pessimistic religion of Humanism. That is apparently the best it can do in the world of religion! Its text is "to-morrow we die," to which some people have very reasonably added, "Let us eat and drink."

'There is surely only one way by which the world can be saved—by the science of the soul; by the principles of Christ who alone has seen clearly, serenely, searchingly, the way to bring men to God and to make the best of themselves.

'This way is not antagonistic to science—it simply fills in the biggest of the gaps which science has left out. So far from being antagonistic, it is possible—in fact, it is now my daily task—to use science itself as the chief way in which the way of Christ can be interpreted to men. By using the results of the labours of those who for centuries have been engaged in medical and surgical research, it is the privilege of the medical missionary to introduce to his patients in the most practical way possible the love of God as it has been revealed by the life of Christ.'

'The Spirit lifted me up.'

'One day when I was standing on the harbour quay at St. Helier in Jersey, watching the loading of boats with their cargoes of new potatoes, the deep boom of a ship's siren drew my notice to a huge cargo steamer slowly nosing her way through the narrow piers of the harbour entrance. . . . Normally ships of that size would wait outside the harbour till the tide had risen.

'But no, the captain was going to risk it. The fact is he knew that if he waited, the delay at the height of the potato season would make a big difference in the price his cargo would fetch in the London market.

'Slowly the huge hull crept through the narrow entrance and then began to turn to come alongside the quay. All was going well and preparations were being made to receive her, when suddenly the clang, clang, clang-clang of the captain's telegraph to the engine-room signalled "Reverse!" Then followed a heavy throbbing and the propellers' feverish thrashing of the water, churning up black mud from the harbour bottom. She had run aground!

'Quickly hawsers were cast ashore, and caught by ready hands were hitched to whirling capstans, pulling the ship with all the might of powerful machinery. Meanwhile her engines throbbed still more violently, all in the effort to free her, but in vain; nothing would shift her, she was fast in the mud.

'Some time after the turn of the tide, I returned to find the water steadily creeping inch by inch up her black-sided hull. There was no need *now* for violent and feverish action, for she was afloat, her huge hull was no longer fast on the mud. There she was moving steadily and freely towards the quayside.

'Who would dream that such a power was in that gently-rising water of the tide?

'The Spirit of God, like the silent, unseen power of the tide, can set us free and lift us up to a higher and nobler level of life—if we will receive Him.

'Plainly the tide could not lift the ship, if the harbour were closed against its inflowing. And plainly the Spirit of God cannot lift our lives if He cannot find entrance to them. Every morning open your hearts by prayer to the Holy Spirit's incoming.'

This is an extract from a Whitsuntide talk to children by the Rev. H. L. Picken. It is taken from a collection of his addresses just published by the Epworth Press—*Solid Sunshine* (3s. net)—commended in a Foreword by Principal Lofthouse. It is a pleasure to note that it was in the pages of this magazine that half a dozen of the addresses first saw the light.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.